

question is upon the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE].

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, do I understand that my amendment is up? I offered it yesterday and asked to have it lie on the table. I did not expect it to be voted on to-day. I expect to address the Senate on the amendment, but I am not prepared this afternoon in any way. I do not think the parliamentary status of the amendment is that it is up to be voted on. I offered it and asked, as the RECORD will show, to have it lie on the table in order to be printed. It was not printed yesterday, and it has been only a few hours since Senators have had copies of it. I have not had a chance to examine it myself to know whether it has been correctly or accurately printed, and I do not understand that the amendment is anywhere except on the table to be called up. Moreover, it provides for two additional sections to the bill; and it seems to me that the Senate, in logical procedure, would consider amendments to the body of the bill and to the preceding sections before they take up the consideration of my two amendments, which are two additional sections to come at the end of the measure.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, several minor amendments have been agreed to during the day, but I do not wish to press the Senate unduly with regard to the matter. I am only anxious that we dispose of it as promptly as possible. Several amendments have been ordered printed and have gone over until tomorrow, and there are several other amendments intended to be offered by other Senators.

I realize that we have just assembled here, and it has been difficult for Senators to get their minds on this bill when we are just meeting in this way. It is a very important measure. Some objections have been pointed out which seem to me justified, and the only reason why I went on with the measure was because I was advised by Senators on the other side of the Chamber that if I did not do so it would be displaced by moving to substitute some other measure. If we might, by unanimous consent, agree that this bill should take its place tomorrow as the unfinished business, I would be glad to move to lay it aside temporarily.

Mr. PENROSE. There will be no difficulty in getting that consent, I think, Mr. President.

Mr. OWEN. I ask that consent.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, just a moment. Let me suggest to the Senator having the bill in charge that I believe time would be saved if the Senate would take an adjournment now, so that we can prepare the amendments to which he has already referred. It is half-past 3 o'clock now. That would give us a couple of hours to work in our offices, and then we could perhaps work at home to-night.

Mr. OWEN. I think that is a good suggestion.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator that there is no disposition whatever to put aside action upon this bill, but I take it for granted that the Senator from Oklahoma, like every other Senator, wants it perfected. The only way to do that is to give Senators time, now that it has been discussed somewhat, to prepare what they think would serve best to make the bill workable.

Mr. OWEN. I am glad to be able to say to the Senator that I have received many assurances from Members on that side of the Chamber that they desire in good faith to perfect this bill, and that is all I want. I am glad to have that spirit exhibited. In view of that suggestion, I feel justified in asking that the bill be laid aside temporarily, and then I will move that the Senate adjourn, to give the opportunity to which the Senator refers.

Mr. PENROSE. It is not necessary to lay the bill aside. If the Senate adjourns, the bill is still the unfinished business.

Mr. OWEN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, December 7, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, December 6, 1916.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Take us, O God our heavenly Father, into Thy nearer presence, even into the Holy of Holies, that we may be purified, strengthened, and inspired by the touch; and be prepared to enter upon the new duties of the hour with confidence, earnestness, and courage; and thus quit ourselves like men, as followers of the Jesus of Nazareth. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

NATIONAL ARCHIVES BUILDING.

The SPEAKER. In the last session there was a letter ordered printed about the national archives building that should not have been ordered printed. Without objection, the order to print it will be canceled.

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY.

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday. The unfinished business is H. R. 563, the Rayburn bill.

Mr. MANN. What bill is that?

The SPEAKER. Union Calendar 105, H. R. 563, a bill to amend section 20 of an act to regulate commerce, to prevent overissues of securities by carriers, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. The bill that the Speaker refers to was called up by the gentleman from Georgia yesterday, on what was called the ordinary call of committees—not on Calendar Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Without referring to the fact that he could not call up that bill yesterday, a question arose early in the present Speakership as to whether a bill, being the unfinished business on the ordinary call of committees, should be taken up as the unfinished business on Calendar Wednesday and vice versa; and the present Speaker, reversing the ruling of the former Speaker, Mr. CANNON, held that there were two calls of committees, one the Calendar Wednesday call and one the ordinary call, and decided that the call on Calendar Wednesday did not rest with the committee called on the ordinary call, but that the unfinished business on Calendar Wednesday went over until the succeeding Calendar Wednesday, and that the call of committees on the ordinary call went over until the next ordinary call of committees.

The SPEAKER. The Chair adheres to that ruling. What misled the Chair was the fact that this bill was lying here on the table, and the Chair supposed that it was the Barnhart printing bill. The Chair thinks that his former ruling was correct.

Mr. ADAMSON. I should like to ask if the call does actually rest with the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on Calendar Wednesday?

Mr. MANN. It rests with the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. ADAMSON. That was my impression. I know I had parts of two days, and when I insisted that I ought to have the right to another day the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] remarked that we had been lucky in getting through the bills that we did consider; but when I saw that we were still marked on the calendar as entitled to be called I hoped that I would be permitted to put in the few hours I was entitled to in order to make up two full days, in order to call up a couple of bills that are not only very innocent, but that would be very beneficial if they could be enacted.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman states that he had a piece of time left. How much time?

Mr. ADAMSON. I think about half of each day.

Mr. MANN. Oh, the gentleman had his two days under the call.

Mr. ADAMSON. I know my committee was called on two days, but I did not have anything like two full working days.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Eight-hour days. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The law does not take any account of pieces of days.

Mr. ADAMSON. Then they ought not to be counted against me.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman ought not to have taken a piece of a day. He ought to have got a whole one.

Mr. MANN. He could not help himself about that.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I understand that the call rests with the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to-day. Am I correct?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk says you are. The Clerk will call the committees.

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors was called.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries was called.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I have a bill which I desire to call up.

The SPEAKER. The House will first receive a message from the President.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Sundry messages, in writing, from the President of the United States were communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS (H. DOC. NO. 1448).

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

In compliance with the provisions of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1915 (naval appropriation act—Public, No. 273, 63d Cong.), I transmit herewith the second annual report of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 6, 1916.

The SPEAKER. This message will be printed and the message and accompanying documents will be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs. Accompanying the message is a great bundle of documents, which for the present will not be printed.

JACOB HOFFMAN (NAEGER) (H. DOC. NO. 1447).

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying documents, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State, with an accompanying paper, in response to the resolution adopted by the House of Representatives on August 18, 1916, requesting him to furnish to the House of Representatives certain information regarding the case of Jacob Hoffman (Naeger), arrested and detained by the military authorities at Victoria, British Columbia.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 6, 1916.

CUSTOMS COLLECTION DISTRICTS (H. DOC. NO. 1449).

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

The sundry civil act approved August 1, 1914, contains the following provision, viz:

The President is authorized from time to time, as the exigencies of the service may require, to rearrange, by consolidation or otherwise, the several customs-collection districts and to discontinue ports of entry by abolishing the same or establishing others in their stead: *Provided*, That the whole number of customs-collection districts, ports of entry, or either of them, shall at no time be made to exceed those now established and authorized except as the same may hereafter be provided by law: *Provided further*, That hereafter the collector of customs of each customs-collection district shall be officially designated by the number of the district for which he is appointed and not by the name of the port where the headquarters are situated, and the President is authorized from time to time to change the location of the headquarters in any customs-collection district as the needs of the service may require: *And provided further*, That the President shall, at the beginning of each regular session, submit to Congress a statement of all acts, if any, done hereunder and the reasons therefor.

Pursuant to the requirement of the third proviso to the said provision, I have to state that customs-collection districts Nos. 2 and 3, with headquarters ports at Burlington and Newport, Vt., were, on November 21, 1914, by Executive order effective January 1, 1915, consolidated into one customs-collection district, No. 2, with headquarters at St. Albans. This consolidation was made for the reason that the customs business in the State of Vermont could be handled by one collector and would result in a reduction of the expenses of administration.

The port of entry at Somers Point, N. J., in district No. 11, headquarters port, Philadelphia, was abolished by Executive order dated November 30, 1915, to become effective January 1, 1916, for the reason that the customs business at said place was not of sufficient volume to warrant the expenditure necessary to continue the office.

The port of entry at Charlotte, N. Y., in district No. 8, headquarters port, Rochester, N. Y., was abolished by Executive order dated January 28, 1916, to become effective February 1, 1916, for the reason that Charlotte had been by the laws of the State of New York included within the corporate limits of and merged with the city of Rochester.

By Executive order dated February 7, 1916, the boundary line between district No. 29, Oregon, and district No. 30, Washington, was changed so as to detach that part of the State of Washington which embraces the waters of the Columbia River and the north bank thereof west of the one hundred and nineteenth degree of west longitude from the customs-collection district No. 30, and to place the same within the limits of district

No. 29. This action was taken in order to facilitate the transaction of customs business on the north bank of the Columbia River.

By Executive order dated April 24, 1916, to become effective May 1, 1916, Winston-Salem, N. C., was created a port of entry in customs-collection district No. 15, headquarters port, Wilmington, N. C., for the reason that a commercial necessity existed which warranted such action.

By Executive order dated November 21, 1916, to become effective December 1, 1916, Gladstone, Mich., headquarters port, Detroit, Mich., was abolished for the reason that the customs business had been removed to Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 6, 1916.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 407) to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. MYERS, Mr. THOMAS, and Mr. SMOOT as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

WILLIAM H. G. MURRAY (ALIAS HENRY GORDON).

By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania, leave was granted to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of William H. G. Murray (alias Henry Gordon), H. R. 16140, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, no adverse report having been made thereon.

FISH-CULTURAL STATIONS IN CERTAIN STATES.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill H. R. 15617, on the Union Calendar, reported from the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar, and the House automatically resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 15617) to establish fish-hatching and fish-cultural stations in the States of Alabama; Louisiana; Florida; Georgia, South Carolina, or North Carolina; Maryland or Virginia; Oregon or Washington; Texas; Oklahoma; Illinois; Washington; Arizona; New Mexico; Michigan; Idaho; Missouri; Pennsylvania, Delaware, or New Jersey; and Minnesota.

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be, and the same are hereby, authorized to be appropriated for the establishment of fish-hatching and fish-cultural stations in the States hereafter named at suitable points indicated hereafter, to be selected in the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce, including purchase of sites, construction of buildings, and equipment:

State of Alabama, \$50,000.
State of Louisiana, \$50,000.
State of Florida, \$50,000.
Migratory fish station on the South Atlantic coast, in Georgia, North Carolina, or South Carolina, \$50,000.
State of Maryland or Virginia, for the special study of fish diseases and problems in propagation of fish, \$40,000.
State of Oregon or Washington, along the Columbia River Basin, \$50,000.
State of Texas, northwestern section, \$50,000.
State of Oklahoma, \$50,000.
State of Illinois, \$50,000.
State of Washington, on the Quinault River or its tributaries, or on Lake Quinault, \$50,000.
State of Arizona, \$50,000.
State of New Mexico, \$50,000.
State of Michigan, \$50,000.
State of Idaho, \$50,000.
State of Missouri, \$50,000.
State of Pennsylvania, Delaware, or New Jersey, on the lower Delaware River, \$50,000.
State of Minnesota, \$50,000.
State of Texas, on or along the Gulf coast, for the propagation of sea fish, \$50,000.

Provided, That before any final steps shall have been taken for the construction of a fish-hatching and fish-cultural station in accordance with this act the States herein named, through appropriate legislative action, shall accord to the United States Commissioner of Fisheries and his duly authorized agents the right to conduct fish hatching and fish culture and all operations connected therewith in any manner and at any time that may by them be considered necessary and proper, any fishery laws of the State to the contrary notwithstanding: *And provided further*, That the operations of said hatchery shall be discontinued whenever the State ceases to accord the right referred to in the preceding proviso, and may be suspended by the Secretary of Commerce whenever, in his judgment, the laws and regulations affecting the fishes cultivated are allowed to remain so inadequate as to impair the efficiency of said hatchery.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to inquire if there is any limitation under the rule for general debate on this bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The rule limits general debate to two hours.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Is the time to be equally divided?

The CHAIRMAN. The rule provides that the time shall be equally divided.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE] is the ranking minority member and will control the time on that side.

Mr. MANN. The time is to be equally divided between those in favor of the bill and those opposed.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I do not know who is opposed to the bill.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman will probably discover who is opposed to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will inquire if there is any disposition to debate the bill?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I do not know of any.

Mr. MANN. I think some one will debate the bill. None of these pork-barrel bills can get through without debate.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, the rule requires that an hour be given to those who oppose the bill. If there is no one opposing the bill, then there will be but one hour for those in favor of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. That is evidently correct.

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt that when the time comes some one will be recognized in opposition to the bill.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I have no desire to cut off anybody. I simply desire to clear up the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that those who are not in favor of the bill will be protected in the matter of debate.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a few words in a brief discussion of the bill. This bill provides for the establishment of 18 fish hatcheries and fish-cultural stations in the different States in the Union named in the bill, and authorizes an expenditure of \$890,000 for that purpose. No bill is included in this omnibus bill that has not been favorably recommended by the Department of Commerce. Every bill incorporated in the present omnibus bill, with possibly one or two exceptions, was incorporated in an omnibus fisheries bill reported from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries in the last Congress, but was not reached on the calendar for consideration and passage.

I have been a member of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries for 10 years past, and during that time bills have been reported out for fish hatcheries and fish-cultural stations, but very few of them were considered or passed the House. In fact, I do not recall any bills that were reached or came up for consideration on the call of the committee that passed the House. Most of the bills that were passed were bills that came over to the House from the Senate and were subsequently incorporated in the sundry civil bill in the Senate by amendment and became a law. For that reason the membership of this House has not received the consideration in the establishment of fish hatcheries and fish-cultural stations in the several States of the Union to which it is entitled. In fact, I doubt if we have passed one bill that originated in the House to establish a fish hatchery or fish-cultural station on an average in each of the four past Congresses.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This bill provides approximately \$900,000 for the establishment of new fish hatcheries. Will the gentleman explain why there is a difference between the direct appropriation made to the States of \$50,000 in most instances and an appropriation of \$40,000 for Maryland or Virginia for "the special study of fish diseases and problems in the propagation of fish"?

Mr. ALEXANDER. The Commissioner of Fisheries made that recommendation and said that \$40,000 would be sufficient.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Would not every one of these stations provided for be for the study of fish diseases and problems in the propagation of fish?

Mr. ALEXANDER. No; they are fish-cultural stations and hatcheries.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then this is for a separate and distinct purpose?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman says this has the recommendation of the Department of Commerce?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes. They all come from and are recommended by the Bureau of Fisheries. It may be asked why we did not report out the individual bills rather than an omnibus bill. The records of the committee show that 66 bills were introduced asking for the establishment of fish hatcheries or fish-cultural stations in the different States of the Union. It was impossible to report out all of those bills. In some instances

half a dozen or more bills were introduced from one State. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BURKE] was chairman of the subcommittee on fish hatcheries and had direct control of this legislation. He is not here, and hence the duty devolves upon me of presenting this bill to the House. If we had undertaken to report individual bills it would have been very difficult to make a selection between the different bills introduced from the same State, and many of them called for the location of the hatchery or fish-cultural station in the district represented by the author, and it would have been a very delicate matter to discriminate between the authors of the several bills and more difficult to determine the proper sites for the stations. Then again, it would have been embarrassing for us to discriminate between the different States. Hence our rule has been to refer these bills to the Bureau of Fisheries through the Department of Commerce with a request that no bill should be recommended except in States where there is a present need for the establishment of stations with a view to the propagation of fish for the food supply of the country, having in mind the orderly development of this great industry in the years to come. Hence this bill only embodies the same bills reported to the House by the committee on the omnibus fish-hatchery bill in the last Congress and does not include any new projects, with possibly one or two exceptions, as I now remember.

It may be asked why we have asked for an authorization of expenditure of \$50,000 for each of 17 of these stations and \$40,000 for the other, rather than \$25,000, as has been heretofore asked. Dr. Smith, the Commissioner of Fisheries, informed me that it may not be necessary in every instance to expend that much money, but in many instances it will be necessary. Heretofore the bureau has been compelled to come back to Congress and ask for an increase in the appropriations. For instance, the only fish hatchery or fish-cultural stations provided for in the last few years have been incorporated in the sundry civil appropriation bills, as I say, by amendment in the Senate. One, for instance, for the State of Utah, was established, and the original appropriation for that station was \$25,000. That hatchery was authorized June 23, 1913, in the sundry civil appropriation bill. An additional appropriation for this hatchery was afterwards made of \$25,000 on August 1, 1914, making the total appropriation \$50,000, although the original appropriation was only \$25,000. Again, in the State of Wyoming a fish hatchery was authorized in the sundry civil appropriation bill by amendment in the Senate in the sum of \$25,000 on March 4, 1911. Afterwards an additional appropriation was made of \$18,000 on March 3, 1915, making a total of \$43,000. There is a request now pending in the estimates of the Department of Commerce for an additional appropriation of \$7,000 to complete the hatchery.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ALEXANDER. In a moment. In South Carolina a fish hatchery was authorized, to cost \$25,000, on March 4, 1914. An additional appropriation was made on March 3, 1915, of \$10,000, making a total of \$35,000, and they are asking for an additional appropriation of \$6,000 to complete that plant.

In the State of Kentucky the establishment of a hatchery was authorized. The original law called for an appropriation of \$25,000. It was passed on March 4, 1911. An additional appropriation of \$20,000 was made March 3, 1915, for this hatchery, making a total of \$45,000. Hence I say the committee thought it wise to ask for \$50,000 for the establishment of these fish hatcheries or fish-cultural stations in the first instance rather than to come back to Congress and ask for additional appropriations. In some instances it will cost this much money and in other instances it may not cost so much, but in every instance the department must go to the Committee on Appropriations and ask for the money necessary for the establishment and equipment of these stations, and the Committee on Appropriations can determine whether or not the expenditure is necessary.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield to me now?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. LANGLEY. I do not happen to be familiar with the location of all of the hatcheries that have heretofore been provided for. I want to ask the gentleman if this bill carries a provision for a hatchery in any State which already has one in it?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I think it does.

Mr. LANGLEY. Why did the gentleman not give us another one in Kentucky?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I am not sure that the gentleman asked for any.

Mr. LANGLEY. I am. The gentleman ought to remember that I introduced a bill for one at Booneville, on the Kentucky River, and talked with him a number of times about it, and

asked him to get a report from the department upon it, which he said he would do.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The gentleman's bill was referred to the department along with the other bills. There are some States where the necessity is greater than in others.

Mr. LANGLEY. We have one in Louisville, but I understand it has not been very much of a success. We want one established in the mountains, where the water is pure, and where it will run into it by the force of gravitation instead of having to pump it in as they do at Louisville.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, with reference to the cost of hatcheries, I will state that through Dr. Smith, the Commissioner of Fisheries, I have learned that the State of California is now building a trout fish hatchery at the base of Mount Whitney at a cost of \$170,000, the State of Oregon a salmon hatchery at Bonneville at a cost of \$100,000, and New Jersey a bass and trout hatchery at Hackettstown at a cost of \$120,000, so that the amounts asked for in this bill in authorizations are certainly very reasonable. But, as I stated, in every instance the Committee on Appropriations will have it in its power to determine what sums may be expended for these hatcheries.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. I am not familiar with the merits of these items, except as shown in the report of the committee. I assume that each item is meritorious, and the question I wish to ask the gentleman is whether, in his judgment, the need of these items is sufficiently urgent to make it necessary for Congress to act upon them at this time, in view of the extraordinary drain that is being made upon the Treasury for the purpose of increasing the Army and the Navy and other extraordinary appropriations that have been made to meet matters of very great urgency.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Well, I may say that the food supply of the country seems to be one of the paramount issues just now, and the establishment of these hatcheries in the several States of the Union is of much profit to the people in the matter of food supply. Very great interest is taken in this subject from time to time by the department which is charged with the duty of conserving the food fishes of the country as well as by Members of Congress. During the years I have been chairman of the committee, as well as during the years preceding when I served on the committee under the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE], the committee has been very careful to discriminate between those cases that are meritorious or most urgent and those that are not meritorious or are less urgent. I wish to call attention to the fact that there are only 18 projects provided for in this bill, and during the last 10 years I do not believe there has been a fish-hatchery bill reported from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries enacted into law except in the manner that I have already indicated. I do not recall any now. The bills that have been enacted into law were bills which were reported to the Senate and passed the Senate, but failed to pass the House, and which were incorporated in the sundry civil bill in the Senate by way of amendment and agreed to in conference. That is the only way we have obtained legislation. I think the membership of the House has some rights; I think they are entitled to consideration in the establishment of these hatcheries. So far as the appropriation of money at this session to meet the requirements of this bill is concerned, I wish to say this: I asked Dr. Smith that question this morning. He said he did not believe the present Congress would be called upon to make an appropriation of more than \$10,000 for the preliminary work; that is to make the selection of sites and make surveys, with a view to the establishment of these hatcheries.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ALEXANDER. So it will not involve a large present expenditure at all. The appropriations made at this session will be for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1917; and the small sum that will be called for by this bill will not be a serious drain on the Treasury in the next fiscal year. The expenditures authorized by this bill will be extended over several years.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Would not this, though, if all the appropriations asked for in the various bills which are pending and which are equally meritorious with this, are granted, probably require the levying of additional taxes in order to take care of the Treasury during the next fiscal year?

Mr. ALEXANDER. This bill calls for, I think, about \$890,000, and if that sum were to be expended in the next fiscal year the gentleman might be right. This is an authorization only, and it will take several years to locate and construct these hatcheries. The personnel must be provided for, and it will not in-

volve a large expenditure in any one year; but I think a start should be made, and I think these several States that are asking for these hatcheries should be recognized, and that during the years to come other hatcheries should be authorized in States not recognized in this bill, where the need is less urgent, but whose claims have great merit.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Of course, this bill will grow considerably before it gets to the Senate and becomes a law. I merely wanted to ask the gentleman's opinion as to the wisdom of undertaking to deal with this class of authorizations, meritorious though they be, but which are not sufficiently urgent to hazard the duty of having to levy additional taxes to take care of the Treasury in the future.

Mr. ALEXANDER. It will be the determined purpose of the committee, in which we hope to have the support of the House, to prevent the incorporation of any more projects in the bill by way of amendment. I can not say what will happen in the Senate. I think all the bills which passed the Senate were referred to my committee and were considered by the committee and are incorporated in this bill. If the bill is loaded down, I am frank to say, I will lose interest in it, whether it is loaded down here or in the Senate. If we ever expect to make any progress in this class of legislation, we must be reasonable about it.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I will.

Mr. FESS. What is the policy of the Government? Do you cooperate with the States? Are the States making any appropriations in this matter at all?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Not in cooperation with the Government.

Mr. FESS. It is exclusively a governmental function?

Mr. ALEXANDER. They have independent hatcheries under State supervision and control. This bill provides that these hatcheries shall not be established in the several States unless the States by legislation give to the Government exclusive control and the State laws are in harmony with the Federal laws and regulations.

Mr. FESS. Has there been an instance where the State has turned a hatchery over to the control of the Federal Government?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I have no knowledge of such a case. At the last session we passed a bill authorizing the Government to take over a private hatchery in Massachusetts as a gift to the Government. It is a fine, well-equipped plant.

Mr. FESS. The point I want to get at is this: Is this development, which I believe in—I agree with it now as I have before because I think the finding of new sources of food is important—but the question with me is whether it is altogether the burden of the General Government, or whether the States should be brought into cooperation with the General Government?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Well, the States have hatcheries and the Federal Government has hatcheries, and the General Government has encouraged the States to build State hatcheries and the States have been given every encouragement to cooperate with the Federal Government in the propagation of food fishes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. If the gentleman will permit, I may say that all of the Western States maintain one, two, a half a dozen, or a dozen State hatcheries, and they spend a large amount of money and stock all the smaller streams, and the whole public is allowed to go there and fish—

Mr. FESS. I was about to say if the Government should cooperate in supporting and aiding the States' work I think it would be a fine thing—

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The State of Colorado spends ten times as much as the Government, and we do not have enough to supply the demand.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. May I add a little to that? In Minnesota, for instance, there is one United States fish-cultural station that does nothing but provide a fish supply for Lake Superior—commercial work on the lake. The State of Minnesota, on the other hand, maintains four or five fish-cultural stations, providing the lakes and streams in the interior of the State. So the State of Minnesota, while it is providing generously for its waters, gets no benefit from this fish-cultural station at Duluth. This bill provides for the county of St. Louis, which contains more streams perhaps than any other county in America; and the trouble with that is that as it borders on Canadian waters it can not be stocked by the State.

Mr. FESS. Does the gentleman think this is a legitimate proposition?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I think it is a legitimate one and most commendable. Certainly in my State it is taking care of the Federal features in restocking streams and lakes.

Mr. BENNET rose.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET].

Mr. BENNET. I wanted to ask the gentleman if the fish hatchery at Tupelo, Miss., was still being operated?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I do not know.

Mr. BENNET. Is the gentleman acquainted with that particular fish hatchery?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I am not.

Mr. BENNET. Then, I can not very well ask the question I intended to ask.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I notice that by the terms of this bill the location of these respective sites is left to the Department of Commerce.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes. Of course, many of the original bills asked for the location in some particular congressional district, but we could not consider that as a wise thing to do.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I will say frankly that the portion of the bill in which I am interested is that in a part of Minnesota. My colleague from Minnesota [Mr. VAN DYKE] introduced a bill establishing a fish-cultural station in St. Louis County, which received my cordial approval and what assistance I could give him. There is a definite Federal reason for the location of that station at that place. I can not conceive of any other place in the State where a Federal station could properly be involved.

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is a matter for the department to consider and ought to consider in establishing a hatchery.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. LANGLEY. I understood the gentleman to give as one reason for the urgency of this measure at this time the scarcity of the food supply. In the opinion of the gentleman how long will it require to increase the fish supply through the hatcheries provided for in this bill so as to relieve the food shortage? In other words, how many years will we have to wait until we get relief through the increase of fish through these proposed hatcheries, from the scarcity of food?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I can not tell, but I am sure the longer we put it off the longer it will be before that need is met.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will it not be until after the next presidential election, at least, after which we will not be afflicted with food shortage?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I can not tell what will happen after the next presidential election. I am not given to such speculation.

Mr. DIXON. I would like to ask the gentleman if the commissioner recommended the establishment of other hatcheries than those included in the bill?

Mr. ALEXANDER. He did not.

Mr. DIXON. So this was the extent of the recommendation?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes. So far as the committee is concerned we have no knowledge of others.

Mr. DIXON. I simply wanted to know the method of elimination the committee pursued in eliminating those in some States and favoring other States. I want to know the reason why.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BURKE] was chairman of the subcommittee, and I was in touch with him all the while. I understand that this bill incorporates the projects that were recommended by the bureau.

Mr. DIXON. And includes all that they did recommend?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes; at the time this bill was reported to the House. Now, there is one bill, introduced by the gentleman from California, Judge RAKER, that we have reported out since, but it was not incorporated in the original bill because that bill had already been reported to the House.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. In regard to the bill for California, my recollection is that, in speaking to the chairman of the committee, I found that the bill had been filed and the report presented and that it was simply overlooked. When it was considered by the full committee, they reported out the bill for California, carrying only \$16,000, with the understanding that when the bill came up, having been reported by the subcommittee to the full committee, it would go on the general bill.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OGLESBY. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. OGLESBY. I think on the answer to this question will depend my action on this bill. I would like to know what there is in this proposition that takes it out of the class of appropriations that should be made by the States themselves and makes it the duty of the Federal Government. It may be in some

instances, as was indicated by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER], that there is some reason for it, but I would like to know whether the matter has been considered by the committee from that standpoint and if these appropriations have been made because it was in the opinion of the committee a matter that should be appropriated for by the Federal Government?

Mr. ALEXANDER. The committee has followed a policy that has been followed by the Congress from time immemorial, and I do not know that the committee considered that question. The committee followed a long line of precedents.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I regret I can not at this time. I should yield to my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE] one-half of the time allotted to me.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I will yield for a question, if agreeable to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE].

Mr. DIXON. Were the recommendations of the commissioner made in response to requests from the committee, or were they made voluntarily?

Mr. ALEXANDER. The bills were referred to the department for a report, with the request that the department consider the bills and recommend no bills except those having merit and in States where the hatcheries would be of benefit and are needed. I will say that every one of the bills was incorporated in the omnibus bill reported by the committee in the last Congress, with possibly one or two exceptions, which I do not now recall.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman accord me the same privilege that he accorded to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I do not want longer to trespass upon the time that should be accorded to my colleague, Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts, or it would give me pleasure to do so. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE] the balance of my time.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would not have it understood that I represent the opposition to this bill. I do not know that there was any opposition to the bill in the committee when the bill was considered. These propositions that are included in the bill are made according to the usual custom, leaving the question of the selection of locations to the Department of Commerce, to the Bureau of Fisheries; and no attempt has been made, and there never has been, certainly in the last 10 years, an attempt to locate any fish hatcheries in a bill as presented to the House, although we have bills presented before the committee that do make the locations.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman say he is opposed to the bill?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. No.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I understood the gentleman to say he was for it, and that is the reason why I offered the gentleman half of my time. The opposition will have their time later.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I have no desire myself to occupy any time in the debate. If anybody on this side of the House would like to speak in favor of the bill I will yield him time now.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I desire to ask if it is not a fact that all the different bills reported favorably here in behalf of different States have been first passed upon by the department and favorably recommended?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. They have been.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Is it not a further fact that all the bills have been referred from the committee to which they were referred to the Secretary of Commerce for the purpose of reporting upon the bills, and they have all been favorably reported?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Yes; by the Secretary of Commerce. They have all been favorably reported.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. And no bills outside of those have been reported?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. All the pending bills have been recommended by the department.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I desire to state that there is a bill pending for northwestern Texas, and there is no place named in the bill for the location of this hatchery, but it is left to the department, at the request of the department; and for that reason I desire to know whether any places are found in

this bill where the locations were not favorably acted upon by the department.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Every one of them was favorably acted upon by the department, they to make the selection of the location.

The CHAIRMAN. In order to set the Chair right, is the gentleman speaking for the bill or opposing the bill?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I am not opposing the bill, but I hold the time in opposition. If anyone wants to speak in opposition, he can come to me for time.

Mr. MANN. I understood the gentleman from Missouri to yield to the gentleman time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will not recognize the gentleman from Massachusetts unless he is opposed to the bill.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I am not opposed to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is not opposed to the bill.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri yielded time, as the Chair understands it, to the opposition to the bill. Is the Chair right?

Mr. ALEXANDER. No. My colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE]—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri wish to proceed with his hour now?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I wanted to reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the gentleman from Massachusetts, the gentleman's colleague, can not reyield that time to some one else.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Then I will yield to him such time as he desires.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE] is the ranking Member on the Republican side, is he not? It is proper that he should have time yielded to him.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Missouri yield to another inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has control of only one hour.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts one-half of that hour.

The CHAIRMAN. Just how the gentleman from Missouri can reserve the balance of his time and then yield half of it to the gentleman from Massachusetts is what the Chair has not been able to understand. What the Chair has been trying to get at is to divide this time so as to properly distribute it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, before that question is determined, will the gentleman from Missouri yield for a question?

Mr. ALEXANDER. No; I can not yield at this time. I do not want to do my colleague from Massachusetts an injustice. I have yielded my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the ranking minority member of the committee. He is in favor of the bill. I understand those in favor of the bill have time coming to them, and those opposed have time. He can use it now or later.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what the Chair was trying to get at. But if the gentleman from Missouri yields some of his time to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Chair doubts the propriety of the gentleman from Massachusetts yielding some of that time to some other gentleman.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I will yield to those in favor of the bill.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I was not proceeding under the general rules of the House where, having control of the floor, I occupied half of that hour. I am proceeding under this special rule, as I understand it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE] is recognized.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to me now?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I will.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want to interrogate the gentleman from Massachusetts, and through him, if the gentleman cares to answer, the gentleman from Missouri. When I inquired about this bill a few moments ago I had not carefully read the report. I observe in the bill that provision was made for a hatchery for the State of Pennsylvania, Delaware, or New Jersey on the lower Delaware River. Now, the shad-fishing industry has been a very important one on the Delaware River. Owing to the increase of industrial establishments there has been a gradual decadence of the shad industry. The shad have

been going away, but there is a very earnest movement in progress to reestablish the sturgeon industry on the Delaware River. From reading this bill I find that there is to be some discretion as to the location of a hatchery, whether for shad or for sturgeon I do not know; but in reading the report it appears that this hatchery is to be located in the State of Pennsylvania. The bill indicates that there is to be a choice as between three States. What we want is that there shall be a hatchery on the Delaware River, as there is none there now conducted by the Government. I would like to know who is to make the selection of the site of the hatchery if the bill passes?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I will answer the gentleman. The Bureau of Fisheries of the Department of Commerce will select the location.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The impression is given here in the letter of the Secretary of Commerce that the hatchery is to be assigned to the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. If the State of Pennsylvania has a suitable location, I presume it probably will get it. If it has not, it is limited to the Delaware River, and the bill would cover any one of these three States.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then the introduction of the States of New Jersey and Delaware was an afterthought of the committee?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I can not say as to that.

Mr. HARDY. My recollection is that the whole matter was discussed by the representatives of the Bureau of Fisheries, who said they thought it desirable that there should be a hatchery somewhere in one of these three States, without designing to designate definitely which one.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then the idea of the committee is that the hatchery will be located in one of the three States on the Delaware River?

Mr. HARDY. If it says on the Delaware River, then that is my understanding of it; but it is the wording desired by the Bureau of Fisheries. They wanted it that way so as to give them that discretion.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In the report it is stated:

Under date of February 29, 1916, in a letter addressed to Hon. M. E. Burke, chairman Subcommittee on Fish and Fish Hatcheries, Hon. William C. Redfield, Secretary of Commerce, recommends a fish hatchery for the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. HARDY. I suppose that was a slip of the pen on the part of the Secretary of Commerce. I suppose he was not as familiar with the details of the matter as are the Bureau of Fisheries and the committee.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I wish to say to the committee that there is need for a fish hatchery of some kind or other on the Delaware River. We have been under the impression that we were to get one in Pennsylvania. The bill evidently allows discretion to the Secretary of Commerce to locate the hatchery in either one of the States mentioned.

Mr. HARDY. That is my understanding.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. What we want is to have an impetus given to shad fishing, which is a very important industry, and to the sturgeon industry, which at this particular time, in view of the increased cost of living in the United States, would be mighty important to the people at large.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I want to reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania and to say that I have no doubt Pennsylvania will hold up her end of the line when it comes to locating this fish hatchery by the Bureau of Fisheries.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman may be assured of that.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I have no fear on that score at all.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. RAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BURKE] was chairman of the subcommittee. Who was the ranking member of the subcommittee on the minority side?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HADLEY].

Mr. RAKER. The purpose of the committee was to take up all these bills that have been favorably recommended. I find that a bill introduced by myself—H. R. 11245—for a station in northern California was overlooked by the subcommittee; but afterwards the committee reported it favorably, and I understand that the intention is, in considering the omnibus bill, to include that bill with it, so as to save the consideration of a separate bill.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. The gentleman will have to consult the chairman of the committee about that. I do not undertake to make any statement about that part of it.

Mr. RAKER. One further question. As I understand it, the purpose of the subcommittee and the full committee, who have gone over it very carefully, is not to require the consideration of my bill as a separate bill, but to include it in the omnibus bill.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I would not like to make any statement about that which would seem to commit the committee. We will try to consider that when the time comes. This bill is the one now under consideration. Any amendments to it will have to be considered on their own merits when the time comes.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. LANGLEY. I notice that this bill provides that there shall be a station in Oregon or Washington, South Carolina or North Carolina, Delaware or New Jersey. Now, why did the committee cover so much territory in that provision?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. We acted very largely on the advice of the Bureau of Fisheries, so as to allow them to locate in one of the three places.

Mr. LANGLEY. Of course the committee did not have any idea of getting more votes for the bill by including all those States?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I will state for the information of the gentleman that for more than 10 years there has been no omnibus bill. This is an attempt to increase the food supply of fishes, and we have tried to cover as much ground as possible.

Mr. LANGLEY. I have no copy of the report before me. Was this report made before the election or after?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. It was made before the election.

Mr. LANGLEY. Is the gentleman familiar with the different hatcheries now in operation, for instance at Louisville, Ky.?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. No; I am not.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman does not know then that that hatchery has not been a success?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. No; I do not know anything about it.

Mr. LANGLEY. Well, I do.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. FESS. How much weight is given to the recommendation of the Bureau of Fisheries in the location of these various hatcheries?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. It was determined more than 10 years ago to leave to the Bureau of Fisheries the location of the hatcheries in the various States, because if a bill fixed the location definitely it might be in a place entirely unsuitable for a fish hatchery, although the Member introducing the bill might get it through both Houses. So it was left to the discretion of the Bureau of Fisheries, and we have always prepared our bills in that way, both when I was chairman and since the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] has become chairman of the committee. We have pursued the same course.

Mr. FESS. In other words, the recommendation of the Bureau of Fisheries, while it is not in the letter of the law as final, is actually the final decision and not the decision of the House.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. It is not the decision of the House; it is more the decision of the Bureau of Fisheries. They decide on the location and ask for an examination of all the circumstances surrounding the case. Instead of putting it into some city in Ohio, for instance, on a stream entirely unfit for a fish hatchery or for fish culture, it would be left to the department, after careful investigation, to locate it.

Mr. FESS. I think that is wisdom, because there will be the opposition cry that it is a pork-barrel measure and that particular locations are getting it, while if it is done by the Bureau of Fisheries it would seem to me to be an answer to that claim.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I am not afraid of the pork-barrel talk.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. I would like to ask the gentleman in how many States there are now fish hatcheries already established?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I do not know that I can give the gentleman the information, but there are quite a number.

Mr. SLOAN. I notice that in this bill States are favored where 13 members out of the 21 members of the committee reside. I was wondering how many States outside have been heretofore favored in this manner and what chance the other 420

Members have to have their States favored by the location of fish hatcheries.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I can not tell the gentleman.

Mr. FOSS. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. FOSS. I want to ask whether it would not be wiser to strike out all of these States, inasmuch as it is a matter left entirely in the discretion of the Bureau of Fisheries to locate the hatcheries, and give them the whole United States. Would it not be better to provide a lump sum and give them the whole United States in which to select the location of these fish hatcheries?

Mr. LANGLEY. Yes; and not limit the department.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. We tried to locate what we thought, and the Bureau of Fisheries thought, the best location for fish hatcheries, considering the large number of bills.

Mr. FOSS. It seems to me that that is giving preference to these Members who have introduced bills upon which favorable reports have been made by the Fish Commissioner. Having made a favorable recommendation, which has been incorporated in the report to the House, that would necessarily bind him to that action.

Mr. LANGLEY. He would feel that he was bound in that way.

Mr. FOSS. I think the wisest thing to do is to throw it open to the whole United States and provide a lump-sum appropriation, with the further provision that no hatchery should exceed a cost of over \$50,000.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Let me supplement the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois. We had the same thing up in the Committee on Mines and Mining, of which the gentleman from Massachusetts was a member, trying to establish mine experiment stations, and we several times had it loaded down so that we got none. Why should not we provide in this bill for the establishment of 5 or 10 fish hatcheries in the whole United States, in the places most needed, to be determined at the discretion of the Department of Commerce? In that way we will get somewhere, but if we load the bill down with many more hatcheries, as it undoubtedly will be when it comes from the Senate, we will never pass it at all. It is a splendid measure and we ought not to overdo it. I think the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss] is eminently fit, and if we could limit it to 5 or 10 a year, or start with that number, and then let subsequent ones be provided for by subsequent Congresses and allow the Bureau of Fisheries to select them, it would be the wisest thing to do, and we might be able to pass that kind of a bill.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. The gentleman is aware that there are two bodies, one at this end of the Capitol and one at the other end of the Capitol, and there may be a wide difference of opinion between the two.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. That is what I want, to do something practical and not attempt something that can not be accomplished.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The fish hatcheries we have already got have been provided for on the sundry civil appropriation bill.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; and they have been put on there by ways that we do not approve of when there were more deserving places which were left out. We ought to adopt some rational system and economy in this matter and not an indiscriminate location of them. I am very much in favor of fish hatcheries, but they ought to be intelligently located.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I will yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I would like the attention of the membership in the five minutes that I am going to talk. This is a matter of great importance. We are confronted in this country by the colossal high cost of living. It is not a matter of how it came about, it is here. Fish is one item in the great food supply of this Nation. If we had half as much sense as we think we have, we would have increased the food supply instead of decreased it. This bill provides for a fish-cultural station in the State of Minnesota. There is one now in the city of Duluth. I want to give you its condition. It supplies the whole of Lake Superior, which has been the fishing grounds for the Booth Packing Co., of Baltimore, Md., which company has sent its supplies throughout the United States for the past 20 years. They have actually exhausted all of the whitefish from Lake Superior, notwithstanding the fact that this one cultural station has been doing its best to keep a supply; and to-day, in restaurants, cafés, and on trains, when you are served with Lake Superior whitefish you are not getting

It at all, you are simply getting lake trout. On the other hand, the lake-trout supply in Lake Superior has been rapidly declining in recent years, and why? Because fishing has been increasing both in Canada and in this country all along the shores of Lake Superior, because of the great demand for a cheaper food supply. But, Mr. Chairman, there has not been a corresponding increase in fish fry. That one station is obliged to fill the needs of a large area, and it is inadequate. It has not been able to take care of Lake Superior alone, and it needs assistance.

It is proposed by this bill to establish another cultural station, not exactly at that point but in the interior, and why? Along the northern boundary line of Minnesota are lakes that lie between Canada and the United States, and that form the boundary line outside of the Great Lakes. An important fishing industry has always existed there, and now it is more important than ever before. When you are served with caviar, which you are assured is Russian caviar in the restaurants of New York and Philadelphia, you may put it down that it is not Russian caviar, but that it comes from the sturgeon fished out of the Lake of the Woods in northern Minnesota. That has been a great and important industry, but has been rapidly declining, because the sturgeon is disappearing for the one reason that there exists no fish-cultural station whose duty it is to keep that lake supplied with sturgeon fry. Rainy Lake, along the northern shore, a very large body of water, has enjoyed a large fishing industry for three years. Prior to that there was none. The catch this last year amounted to about a million and a half. The industry there is capable of vast development. They are up against the fact that they can not get fish fry. The fishing industry of the United States is peculiar. It lives if you supply it with new, fresh fry; it dies if you do not. The one instrumentality which can supply fish fry is governmental. The State of Minnesota is taking care of its part on all of the waters within the boundaries of the State. It is the duty, certainly, of the Federal Government to furnish fish fry for the Great Lakes and for these boundary waters already described. In addition, there are thousands of streams and lakes whose waters flow into the boundary waters, offering unparalleled opportunity for extending the fishing industry. From these come an important element of food supply, and one which should be developed rather than permitted to decline. It is not the interest of my district, it is not the interest of my county, but it is the interest of the people of the United States, because they are the ones who are purchasing and receiving these fish in the nature of a food supply. So, Mr. Chairman, if I might be able to speak further, and I presume I have occupied already five minutes, I would say that I think the plan in this bill is eminently correct. There have been a few fish-cultural stations established during recent years, but how have they been selected and where have they been placed?

The committee which presents this bill to the House has been considering this subject for years. Are they not possessed of some skill, some knowledge of the subject about which they propose to legislate? They have sifted the merits of the various bills that have been presented to their committee during the past 10 years. They have conferred with the various Commissioners of Fisheries that we have had and as a result of their investigations, as a result of all of the proposals, as a result of these discussions with the scientific men in the Bureau of Fisheries they present this bill as the best solution of the problem. They have left great latitude to the scientific executive officers of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one minute more.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, they have left great latitude by simply designating the States, the general area, where the stations should be located. I think we should go that far and no further. Let them place these stations where the region is best adapted for them, where they will serve the greatest good. If we pass this bill, we will do more, a thousand-fold more, to solve the high cost of living than we will ever do by introducing resolutions calling for an embargo, calling for an investigation of warehouses, calling for investigations of this, that, and the other. This is practical and to the point. Let us act. [Applause.]

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, in a conversation with the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. BOWERS, who for a number of years was the Fish Commissioner, he tells me that he believes this bill is correct and properly drawn and well guarded, and that it provides just exactly what we ought to have. Still, I do not object to the House doing whatever it pleases—it can do whatever it pleases, whatever it sees fit to do, and it may amend the bill and provide for a general lump sum,

as it is in the power of the House to do; yet, as has been stated, the committee itself, all of the time that I have been a member of it, has tried to take care of these propositions, not for the purpose of providing fish hatcheries in the interest of members of the committee especially, but to provide some means of increasing the food supply through these fisheries; but we have had very little to do with it, because all that have been established in the last few years have been established by amendments made in the Senate and put on the sundry civil appropriation bill.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Has not the committee been investigating this matter for at least four or five sessions, at each session, with a great deal of pains?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Yes; with a great deal of care, both under the present control of the committee and when I was chairman of the committee, and even earlier than that. The committee has tried faithfully to get some kind of proposition that will provide us a better supply of fish for the use of the people of the United States; and we have not tried to locate, and in fact the Bureau of Fisheries has said that it could not indorse a proposition to have fish hatcheries located on certain rivers or in a certain place in a certain State, because it might be found that all of the legislation thus produced would be entirely lost because the location would be entirely unfit. The committee, while I was chairman of it and also while Judge ALEXANDER has been chairman of it, has tried to have the matter left to the bureau to settle the location.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. LANGLEY. If the committee has followed largely the advice of the experts of the Bureau of Fisheries and if their judgment and advice have largely controlled, what is the reason for placing any limitation upon that discretionary power by confining these stations to certain States? How does it happen that most of them will fall in the States some of which already have hatcheries, and again in the States where the members of the committee live? I think we are entitled to that information.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. It has been very kindly suggested by Mr. BOWERS here that the cost of transportation is very important, and it is. The cost of transportation is very important in the location of these stations.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman means, then, that the members of the committee are so located that there will be a great saving in the cost of transportation, if this bill becomes a law.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I was going to suggest to my friend that we ought to reserve some time on our side.

Mr. TILSON. Will my friend permit one question?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. TILSON. I know of no fish-culture station provided for in any of the States east of the Delaware River. Is it a fact that all the country east of the Delaware River is so well taken care of by these stations that the waters are all stocked with fish?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Massachusetts has two United States hatcheries and one hatchery that was given by a wealthy woman to the United States, so there are three in Massachusetts. There is one in Rhode Island, I do not know about Connecticut, and I am not sure whether it is supplied or not.

Mr. TILSON. How about the State of New York?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I will yield to the gentleman from West Virginia, who will make a statement in regard to the matter.

Mr. BOWERS. Mr. Chairman, this is a step in the right direction. For 10 years past there has been an effort on the part of the Bureau of Fisheries to have Congress pass an omnibus bill providing for proper locations for fish hatcheries in this country. Heretofore in the introduction of a bill the Member of Congress has endeavored to select the site. In the recommendation of this committee the selection of these sites is given to the Bureau of Fisheries, where each appropriation should be. There is not to my mind a single State—and I have gone over this measure carefully—that should not have a fish hatchery. The question was asked a few minutes ago as to the number of hatcheries east of the Delaware River. Maine has two hatcheries under governmental supervision. New Hampshire has a hatchery under governmental supervision. Vermont has a hatchery under governmental supervision. Massachusetts has two hatcheries where the marine species are propagated. New York has a hatchery under governmental supervision. The great State of Pennsylvania, I regret to say, has no hatchery under governmental supervision. The question of transportation is a very important item. There was a sugges-

tion a few moments ago as to why there should be a hatchery in Oklahoma. There is not a State in the Southwest which makes greater demands upon the Bureau of Fisheries, with possibly the exception of Texas, than Oklahoma. In New Mexico and Arizona the water of those hatcheries can be supplied from artesian wells; in fact, some of the best and largest I have ever seen I saw in the vicinity of Roswell, N. Mex.—artesian wells, with a flow of 2,500 gallons a minute, sufficient to supply the wants of the best hatchery in America. There is no appropriation that can be made by this Government that will inure more greatly to the people than this. There is no appropriation that can be made in competition with the high cost of living whereby the people of this country can be more greatly benefited than by this small sum asked for by the Bureau of Fisheries. In going over this very carefully I find \$890,000 is the total amount asked for. The distribution is properly made. In conjunction with the hatcheries this country now has, I believe for a period of years there will be no necessity for further appropriations for this bureau. I indorse and I want to cooperate with the men who are endeavoring to have this measure passed, and I ask the support of this body irrespective of party. [Applause.]

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BOWERS. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. The gentleman has stated some of the States in which hatcheries already exist. What, if any, hatcheries are in the interior of the continent—say, in the States of Iowa, South Dakota, Wyoming, Nebraska, Kansas?

Mr. BOWERS. Iowa has two hatcheries.

Mr. SLOAN. Governmental hatcheries?

Mr. BOWERS. Governmental hatcheries, near the Mississippi River—one at Manchester, Iowa, I think, and the other at Fairport.

Mr. LENROOT. How about Wisconsin?

Mr. BOWERS. Under governmental supervision, I regret to say, it has no hatchery. We have collection stations where the fish of the Mississippi River are collected. Whenever there is an overflow of this great stream we collect the fish from these bayous, and they are distributed throughout the United States, and there is no better work and no better service done by the Bureau of Fisheries than this collection from these bayous. We get the adults, we get the larger fish instead of the smaller fish, which would otherwise be distributed from other points.

Mr. SLOAN. I was endeavoring to ascertain, especially with reference to the States of Nebraska, the Dakotas, Kansas, Wyoming—

Mr. BOWERS. Wyoming has a hatchery.

Mr. SLOAN. Wyoming has one?

Mr. BOWERS. Yes. Iowa has two.

Mr. SLOAN. Has Kansas any?

Mr. BOWERS. No; neither Kansas nor Nebraska has a hatchery. We have one on the Great Lakes, but no inland hatchery.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. BOWERS. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman says that from the overflow of the Mississippi River to the bayous fish are captured of a little larger size and shipped all over—

Mr. BOWERS. All over the country.

Mr. CANNON. All over the country?

Mr. BOWERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. Why not spend this money on the plants, make the fish hatcheries that we have better and larger, instead of blowing in money on plants, with employees duplicated here, there, and yonder, and distribute the fish as they are now distributed, all over the country, from the bayous?

Mr. BOWERS. Yes; but on the other hand you have but two or three specimens that are collected from those bayous. You have the basses, the bream, and the crappie, and occasionally some carp. The Mississippi River does not furnish salmon; it does not furnish trout. It furnishes three species.

Mr. CANNON. If you had one fish hatchery on the Lakes—

Mr. BOWERS. For the Great Lakes there should be—

Mr. CANNON. For the Great Lakes one of sufficient size to cut out the multitude of hatcheries, and one sufficient hatchery on the north Atlantic and one on the south Atlantic and one on the Gulf. Is not that all we have, and could not we save hundreds of thousands of dollars in that way?

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. I would like to ask the gentleman if there is a hatchery at Put in Bay, and is it a Government plant or a State plant?

Mr. BOWERS. It is under governmental supervision and a good plant.

Mr. BENNET. Ought there not to be a fish hatchery on Long Island to take care of the migratory cod?

Mr. BOWERS. There are a couple there under Government supervision, but—

Mr. BENNET. No national fishery?

Mr. BOWERS. No, sir.

Mr. BENNET. Where is the national hatchery located in New York State?

Mr. BOWERS. At Cape Vincent. Others are State hatcheries. The largest State hatchery is at Cold Spring Harbor.

Mr. BENNET. Is that a national hatchery?

Mr. BOWERS. It is a State hatchery.

Mr. BENNET. Is there any in the State of New York that is under national supervision?

Mr. BOWERS. Yes; at Cape Vincent, on Lake Ontario.

Mr. BENNET. In New York State?

Mr. BOWERS. In New York State.

Mr. DOWELL. As I understand the gentleman, two or three of these hatcheries provided for in the bill must be supplied by water from artesian wells?

Mr. BOWERS. It might suffice in several cases; yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Is it not preferable to put these hatcheries where there is plenty of water than to provide for furnishing water from artesian wells?

Mr. BOWERS. It might be, but the expense of transportation is simply enormous. For instance, Texas has one hatchery—

Mr. DOWELL. Will not the additional expense for furnishing the water—

Mr. BOWERS. I say that an inland hatchery, such a one as you have in contemplation in Arizona and New Mexico, could be operated at an expense that would not exceed \$6,000 a year; that is, over and above the regular personnel appropriated for by Congress.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman, I believe, is an expert on this question?

Mr. BOWERS. I would not say that.

Mr. LANGLEY. Well, the gentleman was Commissioner of Fisheries for many years, and I think he is an expert. I want to ask him a question. We have a fish hatchery located in Louisville, Ky. They have to pump water into it from the Ohio River. I am told—and I do not know whether it is true or not—that the land crabs bored holes into it so that the water ran out about as fast as they could pump it in. That was a good while ago. If it was true, it may have been remedied. I do not know. Does not the gentleman think that a fish hatchery located up in the Kentucky mountains, where the pure water gushes out of the sides of the hills and gets purer, if possible, as it ripples over the rocks and flows onward toward the sea, and where the force of gravitation would run the water right into the fish hatchery instead of having to pump it in, where it is necessarily more or less polluted, would be a good deal better for the propagation of fish?

Mr. BOWERS. In case of the location of the hatchery in Jefferson County, Ky., it is possible that the Congressman from that district looked better after its necessities than you did when the hatchery was located there.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman permit me to say that the gentleman from Louisville [Mr. SHERLEY] was on the Committee on Appropriations, and he put in as a committee amendment a provision that the Kentucky hatchery must be located at Louisville, and I had no chance to change that. The gentleman from West Virginia, then Commissioner of Fisheries, first acquainted me with the fact that this had been done. I have done my best to get a hatchery located in the Kentucky mountains and have thus far failed, but I will get it yet. I am not going to offer an amendment now, because I know it would be a waste of time.

Mr. BOWERS. The site was stipulated by the bill. The bureau had nothing to do with it. I did not mean that my friend from Kentucky had neglected the matter in the slightest, because he never does that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman have five minutes more.

Mr. MANN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to speak in opposition to the bill? However, before the gentleman proceeds, will some one in opposition to the bill take charge of the time?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be recognized in opposition to the bill.

This is an omnibus fish-hatchery bill providing for some 18 new fish hatcheries. There are now 41 or 42 fish hatcheries owned by the United States in the various States. This bill proposes an addition of nearly 50 per cent in the number of such hatcheries. It is what is ordinarily called a "pork-barrel" bill.

It is true, as gentlemen who are in favor of the bill have stated, that there have been but few fish hatcheries created or

provided by the United States during the last 5 years, or the last 10 years, or, I may add, during the last 20 years—during my entire service in the House. Very few additional new fish hatcheries have been provided. At various times new bills have been reported to the House. I think at one session the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries reported favorably to the House about 50 bills providing for different fish hatcheries where any old man asked for it. The Commissioner of Fisheries in each case recommended the bill.

The committee has possibly wisely adopted a method which the committee thinks is more apt to pass the bills, by combining a large number of States in one bill than by depending upon the merits of the propositions; and without in any way whatever intending to reflect upon the committee, for which I have the highest respect, I do not think the report of the committee shows any great study by the committee of the subject. Doubtless they have given consideration to these fish-hatchery questions for a number of years, but all the items in this bill are recommended solely because the Commissioner of Fisheries recommended them, and because they belonged to certain States, most of which were represented on the committee. Now, I desire to say—

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Not right now; in a moment. It is easy to say we ought to increase the supply of fish, but after all, that has very little to do with the question of the establishment of a new fish hatchery. We now appropriate, or did year before last—I have not the figures for last year, but they are not very far away; yes, I have the figures for this fiscal year—we now appropriate for salaries in the Bureau of Fisheries \$400,840. We appropriate under the item of propagation of food fishes, which is the main item connected with the fish hatcheries, \$350,000. The main expense of a fish hatchery is the service, and the largest item at each fish hatchery is the superintendent. In most of the fish hatcheries the salary of the superintendent alone, which is not high, is at least one-third, or nearly one-third, the entire expense of service at the station; so that every time we create a new fish hatchery we are spending money at the top, where it is not needed, instead of spending money where it is needed, perhaps, in the propagation of fishes.

I do not wish to be exceptional; I simply have the appropriation bill before me. I read:

Baker Lake (Wash.) station: Superintendent, \$1,500; fish culturist, \$900; two laborers, at \$600 each; in all, \$3,600.
Bozeman (Mont.) station: Superintendent, \$1,500; fish culturist, \$900; two laborers, at \$600 each; in all, \$3,600.
Cold Springs (Ga.) station: Superintendent, \$1,500; fish culturist, \$900; two laborers, at \$600 each; in all, \$3,600.
Craig Brook, Me., Station: Superintendent, \$1,500; foreman, \$900; three laborers, at \$600 each; in all, \$4,200.

Whenever you establish a new fish hatchery you have to provide a new superintendent. He is not the one who actually does the work. He is not the one who really propagates the fish. He does his share of the work probably. We provide in addition a fish culturist and the laborers. They do the work. But the great increase in the expense comes through the additional superintendents.

Now, the original expense of a proposition is never the test by which you determine whether or not it is a good proposition. What is the after result? What is to be the expense of maintenance? These fish hatcheries will cost \$10,000 less than \$900,000, but the expense of maintenance each year when they are established continues indefinitely, and we ought to figure so that we can reduce as far as possible the maintenance expense from year to year. A fish hatchery when established is only the beginning. It does nothing except as it labors from year to year. It has the expense of maintenance. It has the expense of the propagation of the fish, and some expense of transportation, which, by the way, is not the main expense. Of course, the cost of transportation is considerable. It does not vary so very much, whether the shipment is for 50 miles or 150 miles. But the great cost of maintenance is the cost that bears down on the Government Treasury. With 41 or 42 fish hatcheries now in the United States, what is the need of creating new fish hatcheries almost side by side with those which now exist?

It is not a matter of transportation. That is not the reason. There might be a reason for creating new fish hatcheries in some of the new or Western States where there is no fish hatchery within a long distance. We recently provided one in Wyoming. We also provided one recently in South Carolina. We provided one recently in Louisville, on the Ohio River. It may be that there ought to be more. In some of the States they have their own fish hatcheries. Some of the States are more apt to beg of Congress than others. Possibly it is because they have Repre-

sentatives on the committee to whose attention the matter is drawn. Some of the States provide their own fish hatcheries.

There may be a good reason for the National Government providing a fish hatchery on the sea, where the State may perhaps have no control of the fish in the water. But where streams are confined practically or wholly within the limits of a State, why should the National Government provide a fish hatchery? Why should not the States do something? Some of the States do. But if we are to provide additional service for the fish hatcheries at all, we ought to provide it in a sensible way, with economy in view. There is no economy in view in this bill. There is no economy in view in the Bureau of Fisheries; though doubtless if they were given \$900,000 to expend on fish hatcheries, they could provide much better than they will provide under this bill. If they were given half a million dollars to expend on fish hatcheries, they could provide better than they will under the terms of this bill; or, if they were permitted to enlarge certain fish hatcheries which they now have, without much increase of expense, they would furnish better service than they will furnish under the terms of this bill.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The statement has been made by the gentleman from Illinois and by several others that many of these fish hatcheries are proposed to be located in States represented by gentlemen on the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Is it not also fair to state that doubtless the membership of this committee is composed of men who come from States that naturally ought to have fish hatcheries in them, States that are interested in the subject, and that that is one reason why they are on the committee?

Mr. MANN. I think the question of the construction or maintenance of fish hatcheries has never received any consideration from anybody in the appointment of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. MEEKER. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. MEEKER. I note here, for instance, that Alabama, Louisiana, and Florida each will have a hatchery. Could not one hatchery be located to serve those three States, without putting one in each State? Would it not be possible to propagate in one hatchery all the different kinds of fish that are needed in that part of the country? And is not the same true of Arizona, New Mexico, and so on?

Mr. MANN. Oh, I should think it would be quite possible to establish one fish hatchery that would take care of half a dozen States instead of three. I do not believe we ought to adopt the policy of starting omnibus bills just now, simply because the election is over. Pork barrels are what they are! They are not economical! It is not an economical method of government!

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, with the permission of the gentleman from Illinois I wish to say only a few words.

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. As I indicated awhile ago, I do not question the merits of either of the items in the pending bill, but I do seriously question the urgency of this measure. I can readily understand that where it is proposed to make an appropriation or an authorization to meet an emergency, or to pass a bill of such wide importance and of such great benefits as to make its passage necessary and urgent, that is something to which we should give consideration. I can understand how the House at this time could afford to make appropriations for purposes of that character. But for a measure of this nature, carrying with it no urgency and no unusual importance—because there is only a very remote connection between this bill and the reduction of the high cost of living—I can see no necessity to tax the Treasury with appropriations of this character at this time. It is plainly evident that there are enough bills already pending which carry appropriations of equal importance and urgency with this, to make a new tax levy absolutely necessary.

Now, if gentlemen of the House are ready and willing to vote additional taxes to meet this class of appropriations, and therefore desire to establish at the beginning of this session the policy of making this character of authorizations, that is another question; but I do wish to emphasize before the House the fact that the Congress has been obliged heretofore, and will be obliged a little later on, to make a number of very large appropriations and authorizations to meet real emergencies and exigencies, and unless we expect to levy additional taxes, we will be unable at this time to take care of all that class of appropriations or authorizations which come within the category to which the pending bill belongs.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The gentleman believes in making a very substantial appropriation to prevent the spread of the foot-and-mouth disease, does he not?

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. I prefer not to be diverted from this subject.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The gentleman believes in making a substantial appropriation to fight the boll weevil, does he not?

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Will the gentleman confine himself to this bill?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The fish supply of the country is relatively just as important as the hog supply and the cattle supply, and if something is necessary to be done for the fish supply ought we not to do it?

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. I do not desire to be diverted from the matter before the House. Those other matters will be up a little later, and then I shall be glad to discuss them with the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. This matter is up now.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. We will discuss them as we come to them.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I desire to ask the gentleman if the parity of reasoning would not require him to favor assistance to the fish industry, if that assistance is needed?

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. I have stated to the gentleman, and to the House, that I did not question the merits of any of these items.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. May I ask the gentleman another question?

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Can the gentleman advise us as to whether the total value of the fishing industry during the year just passed was greater or less than it was five years ago? In other words, is the fishing industry of the United States increasing or decreasing?

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. I do not know what the fact is about that.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I do not, either. I am asking for information. I was hoping some gentleman would tell us. My impression is that it is actually on the decline throughout the United States.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. I am not familiar with that.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. If that is true, I should think that we need to do something to increase the fish supply, and there is no way in which we can do it better than by establishing fish-cultural stations and hatcheries to increase the quantity of fish in the waters of the country.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Illinois yield to me two or three minutes?

Mr. MANN. I will yield to the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, it strikes me that this is a very inopportune time to pass a bill of this kind. I have heard on this floor bills characterized as pork-barrel bills for river and harbor improvement; I have heard public-building bills characterized as pork-barrel bills; but this is the first time in all of my 10 years' service in this House that I have seen a pork-barrel fish bill come on the floor. This bill directly and indirectly takes care of 24 States of the Union; at any rate, it gives 24 States of the Union a fighting chance to get a fish hatchery or a fish-cultural station. It makes an appropriation or authorization of \$840,000. Everyone knows that this is but a beginning. When it leaves the Senate it will come back here with \$840,000 more added to it.

I have listened very attentively to the gentleman from Missouri in regard to the bill, a gentleman for whom I have the profoundest regard and the greatest respect, and it struck me that the gentleman's presentation of his own bill was not very enthusiastic. I quite agree with him in his failure to be enthusiastic in the support of his own bill.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Let me say to the gentleman that there are eight Senate bills incorporated in this bill, and that those bills have already passed the Senate. So that we wanted to obviate the possibility of its being loaded down in the Senate.

Mr. COX. But under the rules of the Senate they will be entitled to amend it.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Undoubtedly.

Mr. COX. And that is what they will do. The estimates at this session call for \$1,680,000,000 appropriation. The query with me and the query with us on this side of the House who

are to be held responsible for this sum of money is, Where is that money coming from? Who is going to pay the bills?

We have got to devise some new system of taxation unless we begin somewhere to lop off appropriations. I have listened attentively for some sound argument, some logical reason, for some man interested in this bill to give to this House a reason why it should pass. One man bottoms the necessity of the bill upon the ground of the high cost of living, and yet it is conceded that it will be a year before a single fish hatchery is in operation, and it will be from three to five years before any of the fish are large enough to be fit for consumption.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Is it not a fact that the gentleman from Indiana is in favor of reducing as far as possible the cost of living in this country, and does he know of any better means of reducing the high cost of living than to increase the supply of food fish?

Mr. COX. Yes; I know of a hundred better ways. One way is to stop people from going to the cities and towns and let them go out and raise corn and wheat and cattle and things to sustain life.

Mr. HULBERT. Does not the gentleman from Indiana regard one of the elements that has added to the increased cost of living the failure of Congress years ago to do then what we are seeking to do now by legislation?

Mr. COX. No; I do not. We are everlastingly coming to Congress and piling burdens on Congress and asking Congress to do what the States ought to do. I have heard no proposition on the floor this morning, and I doubt if any will come, that the States pay any part of these expenditures. The bill ought not to pass, it ought to be defeated. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BLACKMON].

Mr. BLACKMON. Mr. Chairman, I am not much of an alarmist. I can not agree that this bill is going to revolutionize the whole system of raising revenue. I do agree with the suggestion that this is a splendid step toward reducing the high cost of living, but the statement of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] that we will not have any fish furnished by these hatcheries large enough to eat for a year or more does not appeal to me very strongly. If we do not start now or have some beginning point, we will never reap the benefits of this much-needed legislation. It does seem to me that the gentlemen here who oppose the bill and who undertake to defeat it, do so simply because they have no fish hatchery provided for in their States. I will be frank and say that I have a hatchery in this measure for my State, but I would not oppose it if I did not have one. Now, I know, and we all know, that where you are forced to send fish a long distance a great many die and that the transportation charges are tremendous. The fish commissioner knows more about the needs of this bill than do the gentlemen who are opposing it. They have not the facilities for knowing. All they know is what my friend from Indiana [Mr. Cox] knows—that it is going to cost a few dollars to do it, and that the States have not gone fifty-fifty with the Federal Government. That is all the objection he has to it. So I hope that in the interest of stocking the streams throughout this whole country you will vote for the bill. It ought to pass. It is meritorious, and it has been considered by those who know for years and years; and I would rather have the opinion of the fish commissioner than that of all of the guardians of the Treasury and the prophets in this whole Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER].

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am heartily in favor of this bill with an amendment. Of course, the bill in the main provides for proper fish-cultural stations and fish hatcheries irrespective of whether the amendment goes on or not, and I am satisfied that the House will permit it to go on. It is cheaper in the long run to have fish stations, and better results are obtained than to have fish stations that are far apart, with the extra cost in transportation and the handling of fish and the number that die. I want to call the attention of the House particularly to the bill H. R. 11245, which is the same as the general bill, only it reports out a substation on the Klamath River in northern California in the sum of \$15,000. The matter was taken up with the Bureau of Fisheries, and that bureau reported favorably upon it. In addition to California alone being interested in this, the States of Oregon and Washington are as vitally interested in the situation in northern California as California itself is. The station is on the Klamath River, near Hornbrook, in Siskiyou County, at the headwaters of the Klamath. The trout come from the ocean there and

spawn in the upper reaches of the Klamath River and return then to the mouth of the Klamath and then into the ocean, and many of those go on into the northern streams. Men in Seattle and in other places who have given this subject attention say that it is one of the most valuable breeding grounds of the salmon in the United States to-day. It is not a local matter; it is not for any particular place in the State of California. We have a splendid fish hatchery south of this about 100 miles, maintained by the State, known as the Sisson fish hatchery, where millions of eggs and fry and fingerlings are distributed over the State. South of that about 70 miles is the Beard fish hatchery, maintained by the Government, on the upper waters of the Sacramento, from which millions of eggs and fry are distributed by the Government.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. So that the gentleman is willing to come before the House with the statement of the necessity for a new fish hatchery where there are two within 170 miles of the one proposed?

Mr. RAKER. The gentleman does not understand the topography of the country. There are large mountains between, and it is not a question of the mere fact of establishing hatcheries, but it is a question of where you can expend \$15,000 and get \$100,000 in return for the expenditure of that money, and that is what we want. Further, in the southern part of the State I had the pleasure of going over the ground this fall and seeing the work being done, where the State is establishing another large hatchery at the foot of Mount Whitney, in Inyo County. This particular one referred to upon the Klamath River has been reported favorably by the Bureau of Fisheries, and they say it is very necessary, and that it will enable them to have a substation there at a cost of \$15,000 where millions of the fry may be propagated and returned to the river. See what it means—no hauling or handling or transporting—but the expenditure of that amount of money means ten or twenty or thirty fold increase in the amount expended, for you can hatch them or take care of them at the upper waters of the stream, turn them into the river where the young ones may go back, and then into the ocean, and afterwards come back into this river the next year following, and on north. It is one of the most valuable fish in the West.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RAKER. I will ask the gentleman from Illinois to yield me one minute more.

Mr. MANN. I yield the gentleman one minute more.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. How many fish hatcheries does the State of California maintain out there on the coast?

Mr. RAKER. It maintains three, I think, altogether.

Mr. GORDON. How many does the Federal Government maintain?

Mr. RAKER. We have a fish hatchery at Beard, in Shasta County, and then there is a subhatchery, where they catch the fish and send them and breed and handle them at Battle Creek, and also one at Mill Creek; but this particular stream is known as the Klamath River, that flows into the Pacific Ocean, where these chinook salmon go up that stream and spawn, and because of the various conditions the spawn are lost, and if they established a branch hatchery right upon the banks of the river it would be the best investment the Government could make, because there they may take the fish out of the river, attend to the spawn, and rear them and take care of them and turn them back.

Mr. GORDON. How does it come that that investment never appealed to the State of California?

Mr. RAKER. Oh, well, the State of California is handling the rainbow trout, and many others, to put into the various streams. She is doing her part. This is the salmon that comes from the ocean, where it may go back to the ocean and repropagate and go through the other streams.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HULBERT].

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, when the chairman of the committee was in control of the time I rose several times for the purpose of submitting what I thought was a very proper and pertinent question, with a view to securing some necessary information. Inasmuch as I could not have the satisfaction of getting that information then I take this opportunity now of renewing the request. The bill under consideration was introduced on May 12, 1916. I find that on April 3, 1916, another bill very similar in terminology was introduced by my colleague,

Mr. DALE of New York, who was called home this morning. The distinction is that the Dale bill provides for a hatchery in New York on Long Island and, also, for a hatchery in the State of Massachusetts, both of which have been eliminated from the bill subsequently introduced, and now reported by the committee, and in their place there are substituted hatcheries for the States of Michigan, Missouri, Pennsylvania, and Minnesota.

My purpose in rising to interrogate the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries was to ascertain why the provision proposed in the Dale bill for a fish hatchery upon Long Island had been eliminated. In that connection I desire to call the attention of the committee to the fact that the State of New York has probably been the most progressive State in the Union in relation to the establishment of fish hatcheries. We had at the end of 1914 ten hatcheries in the State, maintained by the State at a cost of about \$75,000 per annum, or half as much again as was proposed in the Dale bill for the hatchery to be located upon Long Island. I find from an examination of the report of the commissioner on fish, game, and forestry of the State of New York that more than a billion fish were let out of the hatcheries in the streams in 1913, and that, gentlemen, is the condition which obtains in the fresh waters of the State of New York.

The end has come for the wild cod and migratory fish in the waters about the port of New York due to the pollution of the streams, which up to this time have not been regulated by Federal action; to the tremendous increase in the manufacturing industries located upon the harbor of New York and its tributaries; and also to the tremendous water-borne commerce of the port of New York, which within the last year has increased more than 100 per cent in local commerce. These waters are the most extensive and the most bountiful feeding grounds for marine life in the United States. The food is there; the rocky, spongy, mussel-breeding bottoms are there; their home is there, but the inhabitants have been driven off. On Long Island, where formerly a few wild ducks lived, now they raise hundreds of thousands by cultivation in order to supply the metropolitan market; and so through cultivation New York and its adjacent waters could furnish many more fish than they originally did when they were able to supply all of the surrounding markets. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] has denied that this question can have any material effect upon the reduction of the high cost of living, because, as he contends, the money that might be appropriated in this bill and expended thereunder for the establishment of these hatcheries would not be productive of results for a period of from three to five years from this time. But you will recall the question which I submitted to him and to which I do not feel I obtained any satisfactory answer. I believe the condition complained of now is largely due to the fact that Congress has not in the past looked at the situation which we are confronted with now and taken action with respect to it; and if the condition which we undertake to remedy at this time had been taken care of three or four or five years ago, we would not now be confronted with this condition at the present time. [Applause.]

But New York is a State of great wealth, and having blazed the way and demonstrated the success of State hatcheries and the benefits thereof the balance of the country will be provided with them at Federal expense, and New York, the great revenue producer, will contribute the largest share of the expense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MEEKER].

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman, it is exceedingly regrettable that this bill was not up before November, for this would have been a very profound line of argument as to the cause of the high cost of living. I fancy that the administration will discover what the cause is about as soon as we get this appropriation through and get the hatcheries, as far as that is concerned. The thing I wanted to know from the chairman of the committee was whether we are legislating for separate States or for sections, and if so, why it is necessary for a hatchery in northwestern Texas and in Oklahoma?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Does the gentleman want me to answer that question?

Mr. MEEKER. I would like to have an answer.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The place where this was desired to be located was at Canon City, near the head of the Red River, because there is not a fish hatchery within 500 miles of that place which would cover the eastern part of New Mexico. The fish escaping from the dam there could reach the Mississippi River after passing through five States, and it would be a great benefit to the people of all that vast section of country at the head of the Red River Valley.

Mr. MEEKER. Then it is understood that this point was fixed before this appropriation was made?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I say there is a demand there. You can not find in the United States where there is a greater demand for a fish hatchery than at the head of the Red River.

Mr. MEEKER. Well, that is located. Now, what in regard to Oklahoma?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Oklahoma has nothing in the bill, as I understand it.

Mr. MEEKER. Read the bill.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. What part?

Mr. MEEKER. I am asking the gentleman about that.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I am concerned only with the bill which I introduced myself.

Mr. MEEKER. I see.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. And which had a favorable report from the Fish Department.

Mr. MEEKER. Having obtained such a frank statement as to why it has been agreed this fish hatchery should be established—

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is understood that the gentleman from Texas has fixed the location in reference to the location of this hatchery or that it has been agreed upon between him and the department.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. No; my bill requested the department for a report upon the bill, and they reported it favorably.

Mr. ALEXANDER. As far as its location in this territory is concerned—

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I think it ought to be located at Canon City, at the head of the Red River—

Mr. ALEXANDER. The bill does not designate.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It designates northwestern Texas; but this is tributary to the whole northwestern section of Texas.

Mr. MEEKER. Will the gentleman kindly answer, if he can, why these two hatcheries are necessary in practically the same territory?

Mr. ALEXANDER. They are not in the same territory. If the gentleman knows anything about the State of Texas, he knows that it is a thousand miles across it.

Mr. MEEKER. It is in northwestern Texas.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The Panhandle of Texas is an immense territory itself and a good way from where the hatchery may be located in Oklahoma.

Mr. MEEKER. The gentleman from Texas has an idea as to where this will be located in Texas?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Very naturally.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It will be on the waters of the Red River, and will thereby benefit the whole country there.

Mr. MEEKER. How are the three States of Alabama, Louisiana, and Florida served now?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Florida has a biological laboratory at Key West.

Mr. MEEKER. What is so peculiarly different between the fish life of Louisiana and Alabama that they could not live in the same hatcheries?

Mr. ALEXANDER. They have no fish hatchery in the State of Florida. They have no fish hatchery in the State of Alabama. What other States did the gentleman inquire about?

Mr. MEEKER. Louisiana and Alabama and Florida are the ones about which I inquired.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I say there is none in Alabama, according to this map, and there is none in the State of Louisiana. Somewhere along the coast, between those two States, the department asked to locate one of these hatcheries.

Mr. MEEKER. Each of these States has a specific sum. Can not those two States be served with one?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I do not know. I am taking my information from the department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be, and the same are hereby, authorized to be appropriated for the establishment of fish-hatching and fish-cultural stations in the States hereafter named at suitable points indicated hereafter, to be selected in the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce, including purchase of sites, construction of buildings, and equipment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. This bill contains one section and a large number of additional paragraphs. Will it be read for amendment by paragraph or as one section?

The CHAIRMAN. The usual custom is to read the bill by paragraphs for amendment.

Mr. MANN. I just asked that before we commence,

Mr. ALEXANDER. I understand that is true of an appropriation bill, but it is not true of a general bill of the character of this one. There is only one section in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The custom is that where a bill is divided into paragraphs to read it by paragraphs. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

State of Alabama, \$50,000.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 3, at the end of the line, insert: "State of California, on the Klamath River, \$15,000."

Mr. RAKER. Now, Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a word in addition to what I have already said. This amendment is in accordance with H. R. 11245, which was reported to the House under Report No. 1045. The bill had been introduced, but was overlooked in some way by the committee. After looking over the matter, I thought it was disposed of with the rest. I appeared before the subcommittee with the memoranda and data, and the subcommittee reported favorably, and the matter was then submitted to the full committee, when that committee reported the bill H. R. 11245, which contained a report from the Bureau of Fisheries. And among other things they state as follows:

When the bill was first introduced it was the opinion of the bureau that what was contemplated was the establishment of a station entirely independent of and apart from the Baird station, but since the receipt of further information showing that the appropriation of \$15,000 is being sought for the construction of an auxiliary to the Baird station the bureau has been fully in accord with the plan formulated, as the work it has conducted during the past few years in this field has demonstrated beyond a doubt its great fish-cultural possibilities. The bureau will therefore be pleased to indorse a bill of this character either at this or the next session of Congress.

Until such time as a special appropriation is provided for an auxiliary station near Hornbrook the policy of the bureau will be to provide adequate facilities, so far as possible, for development in the immediate vicinity of the eggs and fry resulting from the Klamath River collections, liberating the young fish in that river direct, under the supervision of a proper official of the bureau.

Mr. BORLAND. I would like to ask the gentleman from California why he attempted in his amendment to designate the place where it is to be located, in view of the fact that the purpose of the bill is to give to the department the best possible facilities in locating these stations?

Mr. RAKER. This bill (H. R. 11245) says it is to be located on the Klamath River. That river is in Oregon and in California, and the purpose is to let them put it on the Klamath River wherever they please, a substation to be located right where they take the fish that come from the Pacific Ocean out of the Klamath River, and then they can return them after they have been properly cultivated.

Mr. BORLAND. As I understand, there are now two fish hatcheries on the Sacramento River?

Mr. RAKER. I do not know.

Mr. BORLAND. There is one fish hatchery with a branch? Is not that true?

Mr. RAKER. There is only one fish hatchery, and that is at Baird, which is at the headwaters of the Sacramento.

Mr. BORLAND. The fact is this, that the Baird hatchery is a substation of an older hatchery.

Mr. RAKER. No; the Baird hatchery is an independent station established by the Government.

Mr. BORLAND. There are two divisions there of one hatchery on the Sacramento River?

Mr. RAKER. At Battle Creek and Mill Creek, on the Sacramento River, they simply have stations without any buildings or anything, where they go and take the fish out, and then send them up to Baird or to other hatcheries for proper development.

Mr. BORLAND. Would it not be a whole lot better to leave this amendment, like the others, to the discretion of the department?

Mr. RAKER. I have no objection, only the department said they wanted it located on the Klamath River. That is the very purpose of it. It is cheaper. There is no transportation to it.

Now, I just want to say this to the House, in addition to what I said a moment ago, when some of the Members were not here: This fish hatchery is particularly advantageous to the Government to cover the fish coming from the Pacific Ocean up the Klamath River. Just above where the hatchery will be are the falls. Of course, many of the large fish whip themselves to death before they get there, and we do not get the benefit of them. The officials of the various fish institutions in Washington and Oregon have written to me letters on this matter—I am sorry I have not them before me—in which they say

that the Klamath River produces principally the Chinook trout, which is one of the most valuable fishes yet in existence, and it is very necessary to propagate this species of fish.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I want two minutes longer, by unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes longer. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. So that we may get the benefit of it. The buildings will be modest and up to date, and it requires little work of that kind. It is only to put up the places to provide for the fish, so that they may be handled.

The State of California itself this year is putting up a plant at the base of Mount Whitney at a cost of \$175,000, a magnificent plant, and one of the most elaborate stations in the United States. They already have one at Sisson, erected with a large expenditure. That is principally for the mountain trout, so that we may stock the mountain streams with the mountain trout and provide food for the people.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. RAKER. I yield for a question.

Mr. BORLAND. I notice on this map there is an auxiliary station at Hornbrook, on the Klamath River.

Mr. RAKER. Yes. That is the one I am talking about. They take the fish and transport them to the other hatcheries. But by putting the new station there they can maintain it and handle it with the appropriation and maintain the station for the purpose of properly propagating this most valuable fish.

Mr. BORLAND. Is the gentleman providing for an additional hatchery or providing for the enlargement of this one?

Mr. RAKER. It is the same one.

Mr. BORLAND. What facilities have they there now?

Mr. RAKER. Simply a few little buildings, where they go and catch the fish. But they have to transport them at large expense, with a great loss of fish.

Mr. BORLAND. When they transport them they transport them to Baird?

Mr. RAKER. Yes; but you must remember that is off the railroad.

Mr. BORLAND. And according to this map that is about 100 miles away.

Mr. RAKER. Yes; something like that.

Mr. BORLAND. That is pretty close for a fish hatchery.

Mr. RAKER. My dear friend from Missouri can not recognize the fact that there are mountains in that country, with a rise of 5,000 feet in 20 miles, and others with a rise of 7,000 feet. These streams are on different mountain spurs running from the Sierra Mountains west.

Mr. BORLAND. Do you have to have one every 100 miles in order to cover them?

Mr. RAKER. The streams are there. Why not provide for a fish supply by propagating them?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. GARRETT. I think the committee has heard this matter discussed until probably it is ready to vote on the direct issue of the passage of the bill. I think there ought to be a test of the matter now. I therefore withdraw the pro forma amendment and move to strike out the enacting clause.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee moves to strike out the enacting clause. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. GARRETT. I ask for a division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 47, yeas 70.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. Is not an amendment pending?

Mr. SLOAN. I have an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] is recognized on the amendment.

Mr. SLOAN. I would like to have my amendment read.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. There is an amendment pending now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman from Nebraska was rising to discuss the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER].

Mr. SLOAN. The Chair announced that the Clerk would read.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. RAKER. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 44, yeas 33.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska offers the following amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SLOAN: Page 2, after line 3, insert: "The State of Nebraska, \$50,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill is drawn favoring 18 new fish hatcheries. I understand there are already established at different points throughout the United States 41 hatcheries. The apparent purpose of this bill is to distribute the fish hatcheries, rather than to increase the efficiency of the hatcheries already established. The question of transportation seems to have been the important consideration in drafting this bill.

Now, if that is true and the bill is passed, it ought to be passed in such a form as to carry out the important proposition involved in the bill. That is the distribution of the hatcheries for the purpose of meeting the factor of transportation. I call the attention of gentlemen of the committee to the fact that in the States of Nebraska and Kansas, which involve over 5 per cent of the area of this country, there is no national hatchery. There are numerous streams in both these States, and, taking into consideration the question of transportation, it seems to me that we are entitled to an amendment to this bill taking in that part of the continent.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SLOAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Has the gentleman introduced a bill providing for the establishment of a station in Nebraska, and has it been considered by the Bureau of Fisheries and reported favorably by the committee?

Mr. SLOAN. I have not introduced a bill, but I assume that the members of this committee have studied the geography of this country; and when I say the members of this committee, I include the gentleman from Duluth.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I am not a member of the committee.

Mr. SLOAN. And having looked at the map of the United States, the gentleman will discover that there is a large section of the United States unprovided for, and I insist that if this is merely a matter of distribution, which it apparently is, that section of the United States should be given a hatchery. [Applause.]

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment just agreed to embodies the provisions of a bill favorably reported from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which bill is on the calendar, providing for an appropriation of \$15,000 for an auxiliary hatchery. The Commissioner of Fisheries informed me that that hatchery would only operate a part of the year, and would not require anything more than the transfer of a few men to that point to conduct the hatchery during that period. For that reason I voted for that amendment, because we had reported the bill, after the general bill was reported to the House.

Now the gentleman from Nebraska is offering an amendment to establish a fish hatchery in the State of Nebraska. No bill has been introduced for the establishment of a fish-cultural station or a fish hatchery in the State of Nebraska. It has not been considered by the committee, of course, nor by the department; and I sincerely hope that the friends of this legislation will vote down such an amendment as this. It may be that Nebraska has a meritorious case, but the Members from Nebraska should take enough interest in the subject to introduce a bill or bills, and let them go to the committee and to the department to be considered.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. Has not the gentleman stated in the hearing of this House that the whole country was considered? And is it necessary, parliamentarily or otherwise, in the consideration of an omnibus bill that there shall have been a special bill introduced, in order to receive the attention of this committee?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I do not think "the gentleman" made any such statement. The gentleman said that all bills introduced were referred to the department, with requests that such of them as they regarded of prime importance should be considered and reported back to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. SLOAN) there were—ayes 46, noes 55.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LENROOT: Page 2, after line 3, insert: "State of Wisconsin, \$50,000."

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides for the establishment of one of these stations in the State of Wisconsin. There have been some intimations that this is a pork-barrel bill. I do not know whether it is or not, but I propose to have a test of that question upon the vote upon this amendment.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Will you vote for the bill if your amendment is adopted?

Mr. LENROOT. I will reach that later. I propose to have a test of that question upon this proposition: The State of Wisconsin is bounded upon the north by Lake Superior, upon the east by Lake Michigan, and upon the west by the Mississippi River. It has in its interior thousands of lakes and innumerable streams. It once had more fish within its lakes and streams than any other State in the Union. Its waters have been depleted because Wisconsin has become the Mecca of the sportsmen of the country. The State of Wisconsin has already provided nine of these stations at its own expense. It has not one Federal station. Yet those nine stations are not able to supply one-fourth of the demand for fish fry and fingerlings. The chairman of the committee [Mr. ALEXANDER] indicated a moment ago that if a bill was not introduced for a station within a State, that State had no right to consideration upon this question. Mr. Chairman, if that is so, then this is a "pork-barrel" bill and nothing else, because if the interest of the country is considered and the culture of fish is considered, the committee will not, either in this instance or any other, base its action upon the question whether some Member has introduced a bill or not. So, Mr. Chairman, if there is a single State in the Union that is entitled to a Federal fish-cultural station it is the State of Wisconsin, and I have a right to ask the chairman of this committee to explain why, if this is not a "pork-barrel" bill, the State of Wisconsin was not included and to give some reason other than the reason that he gave a moment ago, because, Mr. Chairman, if measures of this kind are to depend upon the insistence with which Members ask for them, the sooner we know it the better, and the sooner the country knows it the sooner it will condemn "pork barrels" of this character. [Applause.]

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the committee to the fact that the chairman of the subcommittee that investigated this matter, and conducted all the inquiries, came from the State of Wisconsin. If this was a pork-barrel proposition, Wisconsin would have been included in this bill. I repeat that the chairman of that subcommittee came from the same State as the gentleman who has just spoken [Mr. LENROOT], but after investigating the merits of the whole situation it is manifest that he must have become thoroughly satisfied that the needs of Wisconsin were not urgent, since he failed to include that State in the bill reported.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. Did the chairman of the subcommittee make any statement to the committee with reference to the State of Wisconsin?

Mr. SAUNDERS. He was there to look after Wisconsin, as well as the other States.

Mr. LENROOT. Did he make any statement of the kind which the gentleman's remark would infer?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I do not know what kind of a statement he made before the subcommittee.

Mr. LENROOT. Then the gentleman ought not to make that statement.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I do not understand the gentleman. I am merely calling attention to the fact that the chairman of the subcommittee came from the gentleman's State, and that presumably he was as anxious to advance the interests of the State of Wisconsin, as the gentleman who has just spoken [Mr. LENROOT]. But the fact remains that with the whole situation before him, and after examination of all the measures under consideration the chairman of the subcommittee reported a measure which did not include the State of Wisconsin, though he was immediately concerned with the welfare of that State. Hence I repeat my statement that if this had been a pork-barrel bill, Chairman BURKE would have had something for Wisconsin included in his report.

Mr. LENROOT. Is it not a fact that the subcommittee only considered bills where Members had introduced bills from the States and had recommendations from the department, and that the committee did not consider the needs of the country?

Mr. SAUNDERS. That is not the fact. I will state that it was ascertained by inquiry that Wisconsin was so situated, with reference to certain fish hatcheries conveniently located in other States that its wants were reasonably supplied from these hatcheries. There are several stations and substations near the border line of that State.

Mr. MANN. I would like to inquire of the gentleman where those stations are. There is none in Illinois, none in Iowa convenient to Wisconsin, and not any in Lake Superior or Lake Michigan. There is one at Duluth, Minn., but it is a long way from furnishing what Wisconsin requires. The gentleman's information as to what the subcommittee had before it is erroneous.

Mr. SAUNDERS. That matter was considered. There is a station at Duluth.

Mr. MANN. That is the only one.

Mr. SAUNDERS. The gentleman is mistaken. There is one at a place called Homer, an auxiliary station at La Crosse, and another one at North McGregor, and another one at Bellevue, south of the Wisconsin line.

Mr. MANN. The subcommittee did not know what a fish-hatchery station was.

Mr. SAUNDERS. The subcommittee was very well advised in that respect. The conditions in Wisconsin are not like the conditions in California, where high mountain ranges intervene between stations. Hence Wisconsin can be adequately served from stations in contiguous States and there is no immediate urgent necessity for a new station in that State.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it is very peculiar that it is said that the station at Duluth is able to supply the fish fry needed for Wisconsin, but that Minnesota must have a new station. [Laughter.] That is logic for you clear down. Here is Wisconsin that has no station that can supply it on the east, no station on the south, no station on the west, no station for the extreme point on the north. Minnesota has one that can supply them, and yet Minnesota needs an additional one. [Laughter.]

Mr. SAUNDERS. I wish to repeat that there are three fish-hatchery stations immediately contiguous to Wisconsin and three auxiliary fish hatcheries.

Mr. LENROOT. What are those three.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I have stated already. One at Duluth, one at Homer, one at Manchester, and three auxiliary fish hatcheries, one at La Crosse, one at North McGregor and one at Bellevue.

Mr. MANN. Those are not fish hatcheries.

Mr. SAUNDERS. They are auxiliary fish hatcheries operated in connection with the main hatcheries.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I wish to oppose the amendment. I hesitate to differ with the gentleman from Illinois on questions of this kind, but very often these questions are determined by whose ox is gored. Illinois has a provision in this bill for a \$50,000 hatchery. My distinguished and venerable colleague from Illinois, the former Speaker of the House, is opposed to the bill, and the other gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is also, on the ground that it is a pork-barrel bill. In another place, at about this hour, there is a discussion going on in consequence of false information to the people of this country as to the alleged pork-barrel methods in the distribution of river and harbor appropriations, and those interested in the development of this country through the rivers and harbors are invited now to the Hotel Willard to express themselves whether or not the appropriations made by this Congress are falsely and wrongfully made, so that believers in the "pork barrel" have their inning now.

An appropriation is provided for in this bill of \$50,000 for a hatchery somewhere along the Delaware River. In that I am interested. I think that a worthy project. Opposition comes up from other sections of the country to such appropriations,

however, and most of it seems to come from those who have very small rivers in their States or no rivers at all. They want no appropriations made, unless they can be included in what they call the "pork-barrel" bill. I have said before, and I say again, that what seems to be "pork" in the minds of most people, is that which the other fellow gets and not what you get for yourself. [Laughter.]

Now, my distinguished friend from Illinois, Mr. CANNON, opposes this measure on the ground that it is a pork-barrel bill, and in the same breath indicates that if you can propagate fish in the mudpuddles behind the levees of the Mississippi, you ought to destroy all the fish hatcheries along the Atlantic seaboard and Great Lakes and raise all the fish along the banks of the Mississippi, because it would be easier to distribute them to all the small points of the United States from the region of the Mississippi. That is a home viewpoint for you. Is it not strange how we see these things from our own viewpoint, and is it not strange how, when we are not included in the bill, we want to oppose what some one else is trying to do? [Applause.]

We are now up against the question of the food supply for the people of this country, and the cheapest food we have had during the whole period of the high cost of living has been the food that we have acquired from the fish supply of the country. Some day that will run scarce out yonder along the Lakes and upon the Pacific coast, as it is running scarce now along the Atlantic seaboard. There is no earthly reason in justice or in common sense why we should abolish such existing hatcheries as we now have along the great water lines, except, perchance, that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] can not get in the bill the same provision for a fish hatchery upon the plains of Nebraska that we want for a fish hatchery along the shores of the Delaware River. [Applause.] I was amazed to find that while it is easy always to inveigh against great States like New York and Pennsylvania, which maintain fish hatcheries on their own account paid for by the people of those States—not a single dollar has been expended upon them by the Government of the United States, certainly not in Pennsylvania, for fish hatcheries within the boundaries of those States—out yonder the State of Iowa, due to the shrewd, careful, attentive representation of its Members of Congress, has already secured appropriations for two Government hatcheries within the confines of the State. It seems to me the cry of "pork barrel" in this instance is very far-fetched, and is unfairly applied. [Applause.]

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to say a word in regard to the location of a fish hatchery by the United States Government within the State of Wisconsin. My friend from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] mentioned the fact that Wisconsin was already provided for. The hatcheries to which he referred are simply auxiliary hatcheries, and auxiliary hatcheries, as I understand it, do not distribute fish but simply send fish out to some other hatchery, and that other hatchery distributes the fish. There is not any national hatchery in the State of Wisconsin. We have nine State hatcheries. Let us take, for instance, the matter of whitefish alone.

The whitefish would have at this time become extinct if it had not been for the State of Wisconsin and its fish hatcheries. The State alone has expended hundreds of thousands of dollars in propagating whitefish. We put them into the Great Lakes at Superior and Ashland, and the fishermen at those points were skeptical at first as to the State stocking great bodies of water like the Great Lakes; but the whitefish that the State of Wisconsin planted in the Great Lakes at that time were of a different kind, the kind of whitefish known as the blue-fin whitefish, and to-day almost the only whitefish they are catching in the Great Lakes are the blue-fin whitefish. The State of Wisconsin has, I think, been the only State to propagate and plant whitefish, and, as I have said, if it had not been for the work of our State hatchery the whitefish, the best fish that swims, would have become extinct. I think that a State that is doing a great work like that and is unable to meet the demand that great bodies of water that touch the several different States like the Great Lakes make, together with the great Mississippi River on one side, ought to receive some consideration at the hands of the Government of the United States. In the Mississippi River millions and millions of bass fry go up into the sloughs every year, where they die. The State of Wisconsin alone appropriated thousands of dollars in saving this fry and planting it in the Mississippi River and other streams and lakes. The people of every State that the Mississippi River touches or border on the Great Lakes are directly benefited and as greatly benefited as the people of Wisconsin, who are being taxed to meet the demand that these navigable waters make upon the State fish hatchery. You can erect a hatchery in Wisconsin and propagate your whitefish and your lake trout for the Great Lakes, and you

can also get your bass fry right from the Mississippi River without having to propagate it, and can send this fry out to all the States of the Union. We have fine railroad facilities and every natural advantage; we are right in the center of a great population, and I can not see for my part one feasible reason why we are not entitled to a Government hatchery in Wisconsin, unless you say that the chairman of that subcommittee, coming from the southern part of the State, far from Lake Superior, did not introduce a bill providing for a hatchery, and I do not think Wisconsin on any such ground is estopped at this time from presenting its claims; and if you can not answer the claims of Wisconsin for a hatchery you ought to grant at least some encouragement to a State that already is supporting nine State hatcheries, that has remarkable natural advantages for the culture of fish, and is doing wonderful work in the line of propagating and planting fish. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ALEXANDER) there were—ayes 67, noes 64.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. ALEXANDER and Mr. LENROOT were appointed to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 73, noes 73.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, after line 3, insert: "State of Tennessee, \$50,000."

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, it is a fact that there is at the present time a fish hatchery in the State of Tennessee, but it is in the extreme northeast corner of the State. It is on the east side of a large range of mountains, and those mountains lie between that fish hatchery and the remaining portion of Tennessee. When you come to establish hatcheries with a view to having facilities for properly distributing the products thereof this hatchery in Tennessee does not at all supply the demands of that State. It is further true that there is a hatchery in Kentucky which is at the extreme northern end of that State, and a hatchery in Arkansas, at the north middle boundary of that State and across the Mississippi River. When you consider it from that point you will see that middle Tennessee and west Tennessee are much farther removed from the supply of a fish hatchery than most of the States, even, that have none. The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in three former Congresses has reported a bill recommending the establishment of this hatchery in Tennessee. The committee of the present Congress reported a bill, leaving out the recommendation for the hatchery in Tennessee; but that fact was called to the attention of the Secretary of Commerce, and his attention was called to the geographical location of the present hatchery and the needs of the other portions of the State, whereupon he wrote a letter to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BURKE], strongly urging the establishment of a hatchery in Tennessee.

Now, this letter written to Mr. BURKE, unfortunately for me, I am not able to produce and present to the House, because it is with Mr. BURKE's papers; and I have asked the secretary of the committee to investigate, and he can not find it in the committee room. We are sure it is there, but at the present moment it is inaccessible. Now, there is no place anywhere that needs a fish hatchery more than Tennessee. The hatchery now located contiguous to Virginia and North Carolina supplies that portion of the country much more readily than it does middle Tennessee or west Tennessee. Now, Members of the House will remember the length of that State. It is a very long State, and this end is some 350 or 400 miles from the other border—

Mr. BLACKMON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOUSTON. I will.

Mr. BLACKMON. Did the gentleman vote to strike out the enacting clause of this bill?

Mr. HOUSTON. I did not. Now, the report of the Fish Commissioner states the fact that the hatcheries in the section of the country contiguous to middle Tennessee and west Tennessee are not sufficient to supply the demands made upon that part of the country. The need is apparent to the country, and the locality for establishing the fish hatchery can not be surpassed in this Union. The cold mountain springs, the cold water that runs out of these springs in middle Tennessee in the fifth district is equal, if not superior, to any in the Union for the purpose of fish culture. [Applause.]

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, this is another amendment that has not been considered by the committee in this

Congress. This morning, in conversing with Dr. Smith, the Commissioner of Fisheries, I called his attention to this particular measure and to the fact, as I understood it, that the Secretary of Commerce had written a letter to the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. BURKE, recommending the establishing of this hatchery in Tennessee. The statement of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON] is no doubt correct as to the recommendation made by the Secretary of Commerce, but, as I say, this bill was not considered by the subcommittee, nor was it considered by the committee. I assume that the report reached the chairman of the subcommittee after the pending bill had been reported to the House; otherwise it would have received careful consideration.

I do not want the committee to understand we reported to the House bills for all the States of the Union where hatcheries might be established with profit, but we have undertaken to follow the rule of reporting none except those which are regarded as of paramount importance under existing conditions. I assume that later on other hatcheries ought to be established in the States of Tennessee, as in Wisconsin, but if we undertake to meet all these demands in this bill we will not accomplish any part of the purpose, because the bill will fail to become a law. My hope is that this may be a substantial beginning to supply a need that has existed for years past, but which has not been met heretofore. Hence, I think it would be unfortunate at this time if we should load this bill down with amendments, because it would insure the ultimate defeat of the bill, and the friends of this class of legislation should face that proposition. If I were in a State that was not included in this bill, I would rather defer my chance to another Congress than to load this bill down and thereby insure the defeat of the whole project.

Mr. HOUSTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I will.

Mr. HOUSTON. I desire to ask the gentleman if it was not a fact that this bill was reported favorably by three other Congresses. I believe the gentleman did not mention that fact.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I do not recall the fact.

Mr. HOUSTON. I am corroborated in that statement by my colleague [Mr. PADGETT], that the fact is true.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I would not state as to whether it was true or not. The gentleman's statement may be correct. I would not be understood as questioning its accuracy.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I want to indorse all my colleague [Mr. HOUSTON] has said in reference to the location of the present hatchery in Tennessee and to appeal to this committee to support his amendment. I wish this bill could be opened up so we could all get a fish hatchery. [Applause.] We can not have too many. We have not had such a bill passed through Congress in the last eight years, and the demand for fish is growing all the time and the people are taking the fish out of the rivers faster than the Government fish hatcheries can restock them. I know from personal experience the single fish hatchery in eastern Tennessee is unable to supply the demand for fish in that State alone, not to take into account the neighboring States which need and ought to have fish. Now, we are in the midst of the high cost of living and here is a proposition which looks to the reduction in the cost of living by the restocking of the rivers and creeks and lakes of this country. What are 18 additional fish hatcheries in 48 States of the Union? There are 10 or 15 rivers in the State of Tennessee alone, 6 of them in the district I represent, and I have tried for eight years to have the Government of the United States to properly and adequately restock the rivers and creeks in my district, and I am far behind and I want to catch up, and the way to do it is to secure an additional fish hatchery in Tennessee. The fact that this Tennessee proposition has merit in it is made apparent by the action of the Fish Department of the Government, which indorsed it in a report to Congress, and the committee which submitted the pending bill went on record approving the report of the department by recommending a favorable report on a general bill in the last Congress carrying this Tennessee proposition for an additional hatchery in that State. Now, there is no finer sport in the world than fishing. We want and need cheap fish, and besides it is a fine brain food, and, according to the late election returns, we are badly in need of more brain food in this country. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced the noes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. AUSTIN), there were—ayes 54, noes 47.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Tellers, Mr. Chairman,

Tellers were ordered.

The committee again divided; and the tellers (Mr. ALEXANDER and Mr. HOUSTON) reported that there were—ayes 44, noes 54.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 3, after line 3, insert "State of New York on Long Island, \$50,000."

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer that amendment, which is practically in the same form as the bill introduced by one of my colleagues. The situation of Long Island is peculiar. It is one of the best adapted sections of this country for the propagation of fish.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. HICKS. I will gladly yield.

Mr. GORDON. Your colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HULBERT], just stated that the water was so foul in that vicinity it had driven all the fish away.

Mr. HICKS. Not on the eastern end of Long Island.

Mr. GORDON. I so understood.

Mr. HICKS. That is in the harbor of New York, but this hatchery would be established on the eastern end of Long Island, or at least out of reach of the contaminated waters of New York City.

I want to say to my friend from Ohio that this hatchery will not be located anywhere near Cleveland.

Mr. Chairman, the location of the hatchery on Long Island would be especially appropriate. We have 250 miles of salt water inland—sounds and bays. We have the greatest shell-fish industry in this whole country. The Blue Point, the Rock-away, and Peconic oysters are famous. Then we have the little-neck clam and scallops. We have the waters there that are especially well adapted not only to shellfish but to all varieties of other fish.

I remember as a boy that my father was in the habit of sending down to the bay near where I was born and obtaining scallops, which were shoveled up by the bushel to feed the chickens. The scallops have become exhausted by the constant digging of them, until none exist in that bay, and you can only find them far down on the eastern end of the island. They are so rare now that they are a great delicacy. I merely mention this to show the necessity of propagating our fishes. It is only by the means of these fish hatcheries that we can keep the waters of our harbors and our bays stocked with fish. We are far enough away from the great city of New York so that our waters are not made unfit for fish by the refuse that flows into that harbor from the city.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. HICKS. I will.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Since the scallops are all gone, what do they feed the chickens in New York now?

Mr. HICKS. We feed them on the poor oranges that come from Florida.

A hatchery established on Long Island would not only produce salt-water fish for our own immediate bodies of water but it would also furnish fresh-water fish for other sections of the State; and remember, gentlemen, salt-water fish add to the food supply of the Nation. Because New York State has been far-sighted enough in its policy and liberal in its appropriations in providing State fisheries are not valid reasons for denying us a Government hatchery, for remember we have 10,000,000 people who are entitled to recognition and that we pay the great bulk of the Federal taxes.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, it is not a very agreeable task for the members of this committee to oppose this and other amendments that have been submitted, because many of these propositions are meritorious. I do not know that there is a single proposition that has been offered this evening in the way of amendment that has not a certain measure of merit. The number of fish hatcheries in this country are plainly inadequate. We could provide in every State of the Union, for one, two, three, four or five additional hatcheries, and every one of them would serve a useful purpose.

But this body is a practical body, and we know how bills are made up. We worked out this bill with the aid of the Secretary of Commerce, and the Bureau of Fisheries, and have tried to report those propositions that seemed to be most urgent, necessary and meritorious. With respect to the particular proposition offered by the gentleman from New York, I may say that I have no doubt that it possesses real merit. So do many other like propositions. But I desire to call the attention of the com-

mittee to the fact that there are three Members from the State of New York on the committee that reported this bill. It is not likely therefore that the interests of the State of New York in the matter of hatcheries have been overlooked, or neglected.

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. With pleasure.

Mr. HICKS. Was not there a bill offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DALE]?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I do not know of it.

Mr. HICKS. Yes; there was.

Mr. SAUNDERS. If the gentleman says that such a bill was introduced, I will not take issue with his statement, but this bill was certainly never pressed before our committee. The fact remains however that there are three Members from the State of New York on the committee, and when we were engaged in working out a bill which necessarily had to include a large number of States, we would have heard from these gentlemen, if they had not been satisfied that the need of other sections were more imperative at this time. These gentlemen from New York were active, vigilant, and capable—and the committee may feel well assured that the interests of this great State were not overlooked in the preparation of the bill under consideration.

My colleague calls my attention to the following fact which I put before the committee, namely that in the State of New York there are 10 auxiliary fish hatchery stations. These stations I understand are not Government stations, but they are serving precisely the same function that they would serve, if they were Government stations. The chairman of the committee further reminds me that there is one Government station there. I did not recall that this was the case. This station is in the northwestern portion of the State on the waters of Lake Ontario.

The amendment under consideration ought to be rejected, and I hope that the committee will so dispose of it.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. BENNET. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] is quite correct about the one fish hatchery in the State of New York. It is located at Cape Vincent, on Lake Ontario, and is necessarily, of course, for the propagation of fresh-water fish.

The greatest single question before the people of the East, at least, is the high cost of living, and one of the best ways of solving that question is by increasing the supply of food fish. And I want to pay a tribute right here and now to the present head of the Bureau of Fisheries for what that bureau has done in the rediscovery, if I may use that expression, of the tilefish, a very edible fish which has materially added to our selection of food fishes along the Atlantic coast.

Now, the purpose of my colleague's amendment is this: On Long Island is the ideal place to establish a fish hatchery for the purpose of studying such fish as the cod and other migratory sea-food fishes, and those fishes are disappearing. The cost of meat to-day in the city of New York is almost prohibitive to any person of an ordinary income, whereas such fish as the hake, a fish which is not heard of very much, but which is nevertheless a very edible fish, although of somewhat coarse fiber, can be had at times for as little as 3 cents a pound.

I am not going to criticize any of the items of this bill. The chairman of the committee and the other members state that they are necessary. They have looked into them. But I do know that this particular item for the State of New York is necessary, and I do know that the delegation from the State of New York has not been negligent. Our colleague [Mr. DALE] introduced the bill H. R. 14120, but for some reason or other it has not yet been acted upon favorably by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Think of it! There is but one fish hatchery run by the National Government in the State of New York, up on Lake Ontario, for a State of 10,000,000 people, a State which borders on both fresh and salt water; and in this bill—and I am not criticizing the wisdom of the committee in preparing it—two new fish hatcheries are recommended for the State of Texas, to say nothing of some which are located at other places where it does appear to me it would be somewhat hard for the Government to get the water necessary for conducting the fish hatcheries.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNET. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Does the gentleman think that the population of a State or the size of the State ought to have something to do with a fish-hatchery proposition?

Mr. BENNET. I will call the gentleman's attention to the fact that we have a State 600 miles long, and with a population of 10,000,000, and that State certainly is entitled to such facilities as the gentleman recommends shall be provided for a State with the population of Texas.

Mr. HARDY. But your area is somewhat small as compared with that of the State of Texas.

Mr. BENNET. The length of our State is something between 500 and 600 miles.

Mr. HARDY. But the gentleman realizes that you have fish hatcheries and substations to the number of 10 already in New York.

Mr. BENNET. That is true; but, Mr. Chairman, that is the most ludicrous argument in opposition to this amendment that I have heard. Because we have had the public spirit to establish in the State of New York 10 State hatcheries of our own, because the Government has not given us any, then they say, "You ought not to have any Government fish hatcheries; you are paying for fish hatcheries yourselves. Why should the Government help you out?" That is certainly a great incentive to thrift on the part of a State.

Mr. HARDY. As I understand, the gentleman says because they have them already, they need them now. [Laughter.]

Mr. BENNET. I regret that every time anything is asked for by the State of New York, people take it lightly and make it matter of persiflage or jokes; but I notice that when it comes to raising an income tax, to provide money for running the Government, they take the State of New York pretty seriously.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNET. Yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that there is an auxiliary fish hatchery at St. Johnsbury, Vt., near the line between Vermont and New York, and one at Holden, also along the line between New York and Vermont; and it may be that, taking those two facts into consideration, in connection with the fact that there is a Government fish hatchery along the northern line of New York, the department was influenced in not recommending the establishment of an additional hatchery by the Federal Government in the State of New York.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, it is true that those hatcheries that the gentleman has alluded to do exist. They are necessary. But they are for the propagation of fresh-water fish. We have a tremendous problem in connection with our ocean coast, and that is to propagate the fry of fish that live in salt water.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for two minutes more. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. BENNET. This fish station that my colleague asks for, and which is asked for by my colleague's bill, that of Mr. DALE, is a hatchery wherein salt-water fish may be propagated. Fresh fish, it is true, are very good and toothsome, but they are not especially numerous, while the boundless ocean may be made to teem with fish that are food for the millions, and which will be especially advantageous and useful for the large population which borders the Atlantic coast.

Many of us have voted for the amendments offered in behalf of other States because we believed they were entitled to them, basing our belief upon the statements made by their Representatives. It does seem to me that upon the statement I have made and by bringing ourselves within the rule, in the fact that our delegation introduced a bill and gave the committee a chance to vote upon it, if they would, there can be no question as to the facts, and having made out our case, I submit that the amendment of my colleague ought to be adopted. [Applause.]

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say but little in reference to this amendment, except to call attention again to the fact that this committee has struggled very hard to limit the number of recommendations that we make to those objects that are most needful and deserving.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. Yes.

Mr. BENNET. How many fish hatcheries are recommended in this bill for the State of Texas?

Mr. HARDY. I shall expect to answer the gentleman's remarks along that line. There is one fish hatchery authorized along our coast. We have a long coast—the Gulf coast.

Mr. BENNET. Is it not a fact that the bill contains—

Mr. HARDY. If the gentleman will let me make this talk myself, I will do it. There is only one on the Gulf coast, for salt-

water fish. Then, there is one in the State of Texas in this bill for fresh-water fish.

The State of Texas is bigger than any five New England States. If my recollection serves me it is five times bigger than the State which the gentleman represents. There is one little hatchery in the middle of the State. This fish hatchery down on the coast is intended to serve all the Gulf States as well as the State of Texas, and that will be the only sea-food hatchery on the Gulf coast, as I now remember. Yet the State of New York has in fact 10 fish hatcheries and fish stations. This is a question somewhat of need as well as of deserts, even though you deserve the credit of having furnished yourselves with State hatcheries. This committee was attempting to meet conditions and to supply fish hatcheries where they were needed.

A moment ago the gentleman had the temerity to urge that Oklahoma and Texas should be served by the same fish hatchery, although Oklahoma alone is perhaps twice the size of the gentleman's State.

Now, another thing before I conclude. You have on this committee three able Members from the State of New York, who are faithful and loyal to their State; one Republican [Mr. ROWE] and two Democrats, as I remember. In the discussion before the committee those gentlemen did not believe that they should make a claptrap appeal that New York either deserved or needed an additional Federal hatchery, and they did not ask it. In addition to that, you have the Secretary of Commerce, a citizen of New York, devoted to the interests of New York; and while you did have a little bill flung in, like a rotten grain of corn into the hopper, no attention was paid to it and nobody insisted upon it or asked for it, unless I am mistaken.

Mr. BENNET. Now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. In a moment I will yield. The Federal Government has a main station at Cape Vincent, N. Y. Is that on Lake Ontario?

Mr. BENNET. That is on Lake Ontario.

Mr. HARDY. That is in the northern part of the State. Then you have subsidiary stations at Amherst Island, Charity Shoals, Horseshoe Island, Ogdensburg, Old Forge, Pigeon Island, Pope Mills, Sodus Point, Stony Island, and Three Mile Bay. Are all those on Lake Erie?

Mr. BENNET. They are either on Lake Ontario or Lake Champlain.

Mr. HARDY. Are none of them on the eastern shore?

Mr. BENNET. They are all fresh-water stations.

Mr. HARDY. None of those are on the eastern shore?

Mr. BENNET. As I caught the reading, none of them are.

Mr. HARDY. At least, you have there 10 substations. Now, I would like to know why it is that if you needed any station your Representatives on the committee did not call upon us for it? I think possibly one of your Members from New York has explained the situation—that your tidal waters around New York are so foul that the fish-hatching business is not successful there.

Mr. BENNET. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. Yes.

Mr. BENNET. The water at the east end of Long Island is just as clear as any in the world. Now, I want to ask the gentleman a question. These stations that he has named are largely stations supported by the State, are they not?

Mr. HARDY. They are all Government auxiliary stations.

Mr. BENNET. The statement was made by the chairman of the committee [Mr. ALEXANDER] that the New York stations, except at Cape Vincent, were State stations.

Mr. HARDY. They are stated in this report to be operated by the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BENNET. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY] be extended three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman for a correction.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The chairman of the committee did not make the statement that those were State stations. They are auxiliaries of the principal station at Cape Vincent, and are Federal stations.

Mr. BENNET. Distributing points.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] made the statement to which the gentleman from New York refers, but he was in error about that.

Mr. MANN. What is an auxiliary station?

Mr. ALEXANDER. These are named here as auxiliary stations.

Mr. MANN. There is no authorization of law for an auxiliary station. What is an auxiliary station?

Mr. ALEXANDER. They are stations where fish are propagated. I do not know just what they are. I know they exist.

Mr. HARDY. The report says they are fish-cultural stations. The list is headed—

Fish-cultural stations operated during the fiscal year 1916.

The report of the Commissioner of Fisheries says that the station at Cape Vincent is operated the entire year, Amherst Island in October and November, Charity Shoals in October and November, Horseshoe Island in October and November, Ogdensburg in April and May, Old Forge in November, Pigeon Island in October and November, Pope Mills in April, Sodus Point in November and December, Stony Island in November, and Three Mile Bay in November and December. They have different kinds of fish that they propagate.

Mr. BENNET. Those stations are all on Lake Ontario, fresh-water stations.

Mr. HARDY. That is what I understood the gentleman.

Mr. BENNET. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HARDY. Yes.

Mr. BENNET. Some one on the committee made the statement that the State of New York supported some 10 State stations. That statement is correct. Now, I should like to ask the gentleman how many State stations does the State of Texas support?

Mr. HARDY. I do not think the State of Texas supports any, and I think the gentleman who said that the State of New York supported 10 stations was referring to these auxiliary stations which are really supported by the Federal Government.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. HARDY. I have only three minutes. I am yielding to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET].

Mr. SAUNDERS. I was the one who made the statement in relation to these stations being State stations. That was what I understood when the statement was handed to me, but I was in error. They are under Government control.

Mr. BENNET. The gentleman is partly correct—

Mr. SAUNDERS. I have no doubt that you have State stations, but the particular ones which have been mentioned by the gentleman from Texas are not State stations. I was in error about that.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to say that these auxiliary stations are stations where they collect the eggs; they strip the fish and then ship the eggs to another place. They have nothing to do with the distribution of fish whatever.

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. I will yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HICKS. I want to make a statement in regard to the matter of the pollution of waters in Long Island Sound. I want to make a statement in regard to the flow of the waters from the city of New York. All the water that comes through Sandy Hook to the city of New York goes out again through the same channel; none of the water in Long Island Sound comes from the city of New York. There is what is called the tide rip, 8 miles east of the city. The water comes up to that tide rip and then flows back again, and all the water to the east comes in from the east and goes out the same way.

Mr. PLATT. That is true, and I know it to be true.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. In reply to the question as to what are subsidiary or auxiliary stations, here is what the commissioner in that connection says in his report:

The principal stations have a permanent personnel provided by law or are operated more or less independently, although the subsidiary establishments in some cases are fully equipped and quite as important as the head station to which they are attached for convenience of administration.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from Virginia. Mr. Chairman, we have been told this afternoon that the proponents of this measure claim that it is in behalf of the necessity of reducing the cost of living. Here we have been in session on Monday and Tuesday and to-day. We had the honor of listening to the President of the United States yesterday deliver his annual address. The whole country is somewhat excited over the very rapid increase in the last few weeks or months of the cost of articles which go into the stomach, as well as many others which are needed for the convenience or comfort of the individual. The great Congress of the United States, said to be the greatest legislative body in the world—and it is never denied in this

body that that is the case—has met. The President of the United States has delivered his opinion concerning the state of the Union. The great Democratic Party, unfortunately successful at the recent election, in control of the Government, in a majority on my right, has finally reached the point where it proposes to do something to reduce the cost of living. With the price of necessities of life soaring in the air, with the household expenses of men and women pressing down heavily upon them, our friends propose to authorize an appropriation, not make it, which may be appropriated within a year and a half to construct a fish hatchery which can not be built within three years, and then to turn out some small fish which will not be ready to be caught for several years to come. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] That is the only response that either the President or the Congress has made to the demand of the people to know something about the reason for the high cost of living. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Hicks].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ALEXANDER) there were—ayes 50, noes 63.

Mr. HICKS. I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed as tellers the gentleman from New York [Mr. Hicks] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER].

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were 46 ayes and 56 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

State of Arizona, \$50,000.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, following line 17, insert: "State of Colorado, \$50,000."

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the State of Colorado has a fish hatchery, established at Leadville a number of years ago, but it has never been sufficient to supply the surrounding country nor even the State of Colorado. There are only three Government hatcheries in a territory of nearly 2,000 miles, between a short distance west of the Missouri River nearly to the Pacific Ocean—one recently established in Wyoming, one in Utah, and one in Colorado. The mountain ranges are such that they can not supply them north and south, and Colorado has needed another one for many years. While the Leadville hatchery is a good one, in fact a very good one for that altitude, yet there ought to be one lower down and in a somewhat warmer climate. That hatchery supplies, as far as any hatchery could at that altitude, trout to a great many of the mountain streams. Let me say to the House that nearly everybody in the United States comes or wants to come sometime out to the mountains in Colorado to spend the summer.

I have had pending before the House for five or six years bills to construct fish hatcheries at both Durango and Glenwood Springs. My bill H. R. 32, providing for a hatchery at Durango, and H. R., I think, 31, for Glenwood Springs, were introduced on the first day of the first session of this Congress, December 6, 1915, a year ago to-day; and this committee favorably reported my bill once; but for some reason Colorado is left out of this bill. I supposed that the committee, having once favorably recommended another hatchery for Colorado, would again favor it. I saw Mr. BURKE, the chairman of the subcommittee, and inferred that Colorado would of course be in this bill, especially when the Bureau of Fisheries has officially reported on page 4 of this report that the Colorado hatchery is not sufficient to supply that territory. Our game is largely destroyed throughout the mountains, and the main outdoor sport the people have left is to go trout fishing. It is not only a sport, but the question of the high cost of living is just as acute in the West as it is in the East, and we feel that if we are to maintain the mountain trout in this country we must have more hatcheries than we have now. I may say that the State of Colorado maintains something like half a dozen good State hatcheries itself and spends a large amount of money upon them every year, and I feel that the fish industry and the fish propagation ought to be encouraged very greatly by the Government.

As a matter of fact, I would like to see every State in the Union have at least one good fish hatchery, and there are some States that ought to have several of them. States like New York, Wisconsin, Colorado, and other States advantageously located for the propagation of certain kinds of fish ought to have several of them. I feel that some Members are taking this subject with entirely too much levity. I feel that the

propagation of fish and the preservation of the fish of the country is one of the most important things that we could legislate upon. It is not a matter that ought to be treated as lightly as the distinguished leader on the other side [Mr. MANN] treated it in his remarks a few moments ago. I think the preservation of fish and the culture of fish is a serious matter, and it ought not to be brushed aside because of its not being any more far-reaching or immediate in its results than it is. All of those States ought to have a splendid, efficient fish hatchery, and if the ones they now have are not sufficient, they ought to have more. I hope my amendment will be adopted, so that Colorado may do her full share in preserving and propagating the mountain trout, which is certainly one of the finest and gamiest fish in the world.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, like most of the amendments heretofore submitted, is not without a certain measure of merit, but Colorado is very well provided for in the matter of hatcheries. According to the statement of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] there are half a dozen State stations in Colorado. In addition there is 1 main national station in that State, and 11 auxiliary stations, of which 7 are engaged in the business of handling brook trout, so that Colorado has not been overlooked, and her wants are better provided for than perhaps is the case in any other State in the Union.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I find here on page 4 of the report of this bill this statement:

Existing hatcheries in South Dakota, Colorado, southern Texas, and Missouri can not produce enough fish to supply the local demand and stock the intervening waters.

Mr. SAUNDERS. That may be true. No State in the Union has a sufficient number of hatcheries for existing needs, but Colorado with 1 main station, 11 substations, and a half dozen State stations certainly is in no immediate need of another station. Her needs are not so crying as those of other sections.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This question of the distribution of fish hatcheries is not altogether a question of locality or a question of States. It is a question very largely of the needs of the country. I presume more fish hatcheries could be used in every State in the Union, especially in Colorado, but in the hearings held when we appropriated for these hatcheries that are now in existence we discovered that the Bureau of Fisheries in the Department of Commerce had a distinct policy on the subject. Their policy was to promote as far as possible the propagation of commercial fish, and not to be led any further than necessary into the propagation of fish for sport or pleasure. It seems that in Colorado they have a very important station that propagates mountain trout, and it has 11 auxiliary stations. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] pointed out, these auxiliary stations are established without definite authority of law, and yet in some cases they have grown to a considerable size. One in Colorado particularly serves a very large territory, and all of the territory of Colorado necessary to be served with mountain trout can be served, but the Secretary here says that his policy has been to promote and encourage and to ask Congress to encourage only the proposition of commercial fish useful for the food of a large part of the people of the country. I read from the hearings:

Secretary REDFIELD. I was coming to that, Mr. Chairman. The difficulty we are up against is always this: The pressure from the sportsmen and the private fishermen, which has resulted in establishing a number of hatcheries, and, on the other hand, the need of the great commercial fisheries adding to the food resources of the country. Now, we believe that the great commercial fisheries ought to have the preference everywhere. That is our definite policy. Now, all of these stations where the increases are made are those that deal with food supplies and the others are those which deal largely with the demands of sportsmen.

However desirable it might be to have more for the demand of sportsmen, I think the committee must have seen that 1 fish hatchery in Colorado with 11 auxiliaries was ample to supply the mountain territory of Colorado with a peculiar character of fish adapted to those streams, but that elsewhere in the United States there was a large opportunity for the development of food fish on a commercial basis that would really add to the food supply of the country. If this bill is drafted upon that plan, it does seem to me that we ought to follow as well as we can that definitely laid-out program of the Bureau of Fisheries of the Department of Commerce. We ought not simply to add these stations because they would be desirable or because they would serve some particular advantage in a particular locality. The great question is, Do they fit into the policy and recommendations of the Department of Commerce and the Bureau of Fisheries for increasing the commercial food supply of the country?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I am inclined to support the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR], which, I think,

goes along very well with some other portions of this bill, especially that portion which provides a fish hatchery in northwestern Texas. If there is any place in the world that needs fish it is northwestern Texas. A man was traveling down in northwestern Texas not long ago and came across another who was hauling water. He asked him how far he had been hauling it, and the man replied for 3 miles. The traveler then said, "Why do you not dig a well and get water in that way?" and the man replied, "Well, it is just about as far to water in that direction as it is in the other." [Laughter.]

Mr. SLOAN. But as I understand it, the purpose of this fish hatchery in northwestern Texas is to propagate flying fish.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That would help some, for it would relieve the cowboys of the necessity of riding a thousand miles to the Gulf.

They can lariat these fish, I suppose, before breakfast, if there is only some water supplied. If there is any place that needs fish, I think, Mr. Chairman, it is northwest Texas, and they need water there also. I do not know whether there is any provision in this bill for supplying water. I have heard something about artesian wells in this connection. I hope they have some provision for water for northwestern Texas for the hatchery and also for Trinity River when we get on the river and harbor bill. This can easily be supplied by artesian wells at a trifling expense, but just what kind of fish—

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will.

Mr. HARDY. Now that the gentleman is in a discursive humor, can the gentleman tell us whether he thinks Mars is inhabited?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman can answer that question for himself.

Mr. HARDY. I thought the gentleman wanted to give wide information.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman probably can represent Mars as well as he could some other portion of the country. If I described it he would want to put a fish hatchery there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words. Mr. Chairman, I should like to call the attention of the committee to the fact that all the world comes to Colorado to fish. In addition to producing the most gold of any other State and the best crops, the good people living in Colorado have invited the world to come out there and live during the summer and fish, and, happily, most of the people have accepted that invitation and have come. Especially have we been favored by the gentleman from New York, who spoke as rather against sportsmen, who had the pleasure of getting after the trout in our streams out there. We would like to have some more money appropriated in order that we may entertain the world when it comes there. Direct appropriations are made from time to time in Congress in order that we may entertain people who come from abroad and, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that it is only fair that in this distribution of appropriations, or authorizations for appropriations, that Colorado should receive some special attention. As the world war goes on there is nothing else left over there to see and Colorado alone possesses scenery which all the world is anxious to see and from time to time a large portion of it does see. We ask again serious consideration of the amendment offered by my colleague [Mr. TAYLOR]. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

The question was taken and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

State of Pennsylvania, Delaware, or New Jersey, on the lower Delaware River, \$50,000.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 23, after the word "river," insert "or at the headwaters of the Delaware Bay," so that it will read "on the lower Delaware River or at the headwaters of the Delaware Bay, \$50,000."

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is unique as compared with every other amendment offered here to-day, because it does not increase the appropriation in this bill. The language in the bill concerning this particular item reads as follows:

State of Pennsylvania, Delaware, or New Jersey, on the lower Delaware River, \$50,000.

The amendment I have proposed, if adopted, will cause the language to read as follows:

State of Pennsylvania, Delaware, or New Jersey, on the lower Delaware River or at the headwaters of the Delaware Bay, \$50,000.

I propose this amendment because I think that if this bill should become a law the Secretary of Commerce should be given more jurisdiction and wider power in deciding upon a site to establish this station.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. I will not for the moment, if the gentleman will kindly excuse me.

At the headwaters of the Delaware Bay, which is a salt-water body, there is an ample supply of fresh water in various streams emptying into the bay and the Delaware River, which, as everyone knows, empties into the bay at its headwaters, and is a fresh-water stream. It is a well-known fact that in spawning the shad which come up the Delaware Bay and River in the spring of the year need fresh water, but it must be water that is unpolluted. The Delaware River a short distance above the headwaters of the bay is polluted by factory waste and other causes, thereby killing annually millions of young fish which are hatched from the spawning beds. This is particularly true of the shad. If the language in the bill is not changed, it will curtail the power of the Government authorities in establishing this station, should they find an advantageous site or a more advantageous locality along the shores of the Delaware Bay. I am not going to detain the House this afternoon with extensive remarks on the merits of this proposition except to say that the establishment of a fish hatchery is essential if the fishing industry, and particularly the shad industry, is to be encouraged. The shad haul, particularly in the last few seasons, has been steadily decreasing, and I could cite figures to show that the propagation of these fish at a fish-cultural station is necessary if the supply of this fish food is to be continued. I have proposed this amendment because I believe that its adoption is necessary in order to properly round out the bill. I understand that my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is opposed to this amendment. I take it he is going to follow me and ask you to vote against it; but I submit that an amendment that perfects a bill which may become a law and which does not cause an increase in the appropriation is one with merit that the committee might well consider and place in this bill. I have proposed it with no intention of creating an undue advantage in favor of my State for the proposed site. That is all I have to say about it at present.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I do not object to the delegation from Delaware making this argument for home consumption, but I differ from the delegation from Delaware in this [laughter], that instead of giving the Commissioner of Fisheries "wider powers," as the gentleman says, the purpose of his amendment seems to be to limit the jurisdiction and the judgment of the Commissioner of Fisheries, so that instead of giving Pennsylvania or New Jersey a chance to get this hatchery it shall be located in the State of Delaware. No one can find fault with our brilliant colleague from the State of Delaware for what he is undertaking to do. His difficulty is akin to that which arises whenever we come to a bill of this kind. The selfishness of human nature will out. Instead of permitting the Commissioner of Fisheries to exercise his wise discretion in regard to fresh water or salt water in the location of this hatchery, the gentleman from Delaware desires that the Commissioner of Fisheries shall be given instructions to locate this hatchery in the State of Delaware.

Now, it has been indicated in the literature on this subject that Pennsylvania and New Jersey will have a chance before the Commissioner of Fisheries to obtain this hatchery if those States desire to enter the competition. Evidently the purpose of the gentleman from Delaware, after Pennsylvania has gone into the net with the vote of 36 Representatives and New Jersey has gone in with the vote of 12 Representatives, is to tie that vote onto the tail of the vote of the entire delegation from the State of Delaware and cinch the hatchery. I question whether the brilliant gentleman from Delaware will be able to get away with that trick if this House and the delegation from New Jersey and Pennsylvania know themselves. I think this amendment is vicious [laughter] and ought to be voted down.

Mr. OGLESBY. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If I have the time.

Mr. OGLESBY. As I understand the gentleman's position, it is that having a third of a chance in his State of having the fish hatchery there, it will get the entire delegation?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I would not object to the State of Delaware getting a fish hatchery, but when the committee comes into the House and suggests this hatchery should go into Pennsylvania, which has 36 votes here, or in New Jersey, which has 12 votes, it seems to me the State of Delaware, which has 1 vote, ought to play fair, powerful and potential as

its delegation is in this House. The Delaware delegation should give the larger States at least a show for their white alley when the time comes to make the selection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask to have the amendment again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report the amendment.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, when the amendment was first reported I thought I understood it, but when my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] addressed the committee just now, I thought that I must have been mistaken as to what it provided. But on hearing the amendment read here, I think my first understanding was correct. I was led to believe by my friend from Pennsylvania that the amendment would require that this fish hatchery should be established in Delaware and that Pennsylvania was cut out, but I learn now from hearing the amendment read again that the gentleman only is afraid that Delaware will get it on its merits, and he is unwilling to have the matter disposed of on its merits because Pennsylvania has 36 votes in the House and Delaware has only 1. [Applause.] I protest in behalf of the delegation from Pennsylvania if they take such a view as that.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is not objecting to Delaware presenting this on its merits, but the gentleman is objecting to the attitude of the delegation from the State of Delaware on this present amendment.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman does not understand the amendment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman knows the geography of the country, which, evidently, the gentleman from Illinois does not.

Mr. MANN. I know some geography and I know the English language, and I am sure the gentleman knows both.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman—

Mr. MANN. I do not yield to the gentleman until I make a little statement. The language of the amendment is to make the fish-hatchery location on the lower Delaware River or on the upper Delaware Bay, whatever it is, including the State of Pennsylvania, Delaware, or New Jersey. It does not require the location of the fish hatchery in Delaware. It leaves it open for the proper place to be selected, and if it did require it I would not be in favor of the amendment. I think the gentleman has misunderstood the amendment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The provision in the bill is sufficiently comprehensive to permit this hatchery to be located in the State of Pennsylvania on the Delaware River, in the State of New Jersey on the Delaware River, or in the State of Delaware, which is also on the Delaware River. But the gentleman from Delaware is endeavoring to limit the designation of the location of this hatchery to the headwaters of the Delaware Bay.

Mr. MANN. Not at all. The gentleman again misunderstands the amendment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then what is the purpose?

Mr. MANN. He is not endeavoring to limit it to the headwaters of the Delaware Bay. He is leaving it to be located on the headwaters of the Delaware Bay or the lower Delaware River.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. What is the necessity of the gentleman's amendment? The bill is sufficiently comprehensive to cover the State of Delaware. The gentleman does not deny that. He knows geography, as he has indicated.

Mr. MANN. I take it that the bill is not sufficiently comprehensive to locate this fish hatchery on the upper Delaware Bay. It must be on the river, under the bill. Now, it may be desirable to locate it on the bay.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I ask the gentleman why the State of Delaware is included in the three States if it is not to be considered whenever the time comes for locating this hatchery? Does the gentleman mean to say that the Department of Commerce would not have discretion to locate this hatchery in the State of Delaware under the language of the bill?

Mr. MANN. I do not know whether they would have the discretion or not, but the question has arisen as to whether they would have the discretion. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] says they would have it. Very well. Then the amendment of the gentleman from Delaware only carries

out the impression the gentleman from Pennsylvania has. It does not change the situation at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. Miller].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. ALEXANDER and Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania demanded a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 56, noes 59.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. MILLER of Delaware and Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 51, noes 30.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

State of Texas, on or along the Gulf coast, for the propagation of sea fish, \$50,000.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Foss: Strike out all of section 1, down to the proviso on page 3, and insert:

"That the sum of \$500,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be, and the same is hereby, authorized to be appropriated for the establishment of fish-hatching and fish-cultural stations in the United States at suitable points to be selected, in the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce, including purchase of sites, construction of buildings, and equipment: *Provided*, That not more than \$50,000 shall be expended in the establishment of each station."

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does certain things. In the first place, it provides a lump sum for the establishment of fish-hatching and fish-cultural stations, in the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce, anywhere in the United States, and not alone in the particular States enumerated in this bill.

I, from the State standpoint, have no objection to this measure. Illinois is included in the list of favored States. But when the committee or when this House designates particular States and also particular rivers and particular lakes, it raises a question in the minds of persons even here on this floor, and certainly in the mind of the public at large, that possibly the sites may have been selected in advance.

Now, for my part I do not believe it. I would not for a moment impugn the motives of the committee. But nevertheless we ought, in passing legislation here of this character, which in some quarters is called "pork-barrel" legislation, to put it on a plane above public criticism and public suspicion. [Applause.] And the way to do it is to strike out every State and every river and every lake, and to say to the Secretary of Commerce and his assistants and his experts, "You select the sites, and the whole United States is open to you." [Applause.]

I have limited this lump sum to \$500,000, which would allow the establishment of 18 stations at approximately \$25,000 each or 10 at \$50,000 each, and if any of those States which are enumerated have special advantages, why, of course, the Fish Commissioner and his experts, and the Secretary of Commerce, who is over them all, would select those sites which are especially adapted. And then in this provision I have placed the limitation upon the amount to be expended on each station at \$50,000, which is the limitation placed upon each station in this measure.

I trust, Mr. Chairman, that this provision will be adopted, because it will eliminate all criticism and will place every Member on the floor of this House upon an equal standing with every other in the eyes of his constituents and in the eyes of the country. [Applause.]

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, every project recommended in this bill is the deliberate selection and choice of the Bureau of Fisheries; and, as I stated in my opening, every project included in this bill, with possibly one or two exceptions, was included in the omnibus bill reported in the last Congress. The Department has had these projects under consideration for years past. We have not passed any bills for years past, except those carried in the sundry civil appropriation bills, with possibly very few exceptions, and I think if the membership of this House favor this class of legislation, if they regard the establishment of fish hatcheries and fish-cultural stations as important to the conservation of food fishes, we should go forward now along the lines suggested by the committee who have given the question their best consideration. After having considered the needs of all the States in the Union whose claims have been presented to the committee, and acting on the advice of the Bureau of Fisheries of the Department of Commerce, we have included these

projects in this bill that are regarded of the greatest present need. And I think it would be a mistake at this time for us to depart from this policy and throw the question back to the Bureau of Fisheries or to the Department of Commerce for further consideration and appropriate a lump sum for the establishment of fish hatcheries and fish-cultural stations and leave it to the department to say where they may be located. We have the best judgment of the department before us now, and should act on it. I assume that in the event the whole subject matter is again referred to the department the logrolling process will not stop; it will simply begin. [Applause.]

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I have favored the proposition of either extending the fish hatcheries now existing or the creation of new ones by Federal aid if we could eliminate the idea that we are getting votes for personal or State reasons; in a word, if we could put it on a National rather than a State or sectional basis, and if we could put this under the control of those who know, from expert information, the needs of the country, we could certainly eliminate this unsavory element of pork which has crept into the discussion.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to an inquiry?

Mr. FESS. In a moment. Time and time again during the day there have been offered amendments increasing the number of stations, and we have voted against them because we are told, "If you admit that one, others will follow, and we will also have to admit them"; and when some Member stated that an important State had been omitted, the chairman replied that there had not been any bill providing for it. All of these things lead to—I do not want to use the word "suspicion"—the unsavory element or feeling that we are standing for locality. Each Member is voting from a selfish rather than a national viewpoint. I wish we could eliminate that, and I think we could do it if we would place the whole matter in the hands of the Secretary of Commerce to be determined instead of determining it by the vote of individual States here on the floor of the House. There is so much of that element, not in legislation but in what is said on the floor and carried in the press of the country, that it becomes to most of us an unsavory proposition. I would like to vote for a measure looking to find new sources of food or the increase of our known sources. I very much dislike to vote against any movement to find new foods or to increase the supply of old which would help to reduce the cost of living, but I can not get the consent of my mind to vote for a measure that seems to have been primarily arranged with the view of getting votes enough in the House to pass it rather than to put it on its merits. I notice that the chairman just now said that there is no item in the bill that has not been recommended by the Bureau of Fisheries. That ought to allay one's suspicion; but at the same time the Bureau of Fisheries, knowing the methods too often employed in omnibus legislation, might have recommended items with reference to the final vote in the House. I wish that we could eliminate that element of suspicion in toto. Why not pass this measure in the form of this amendment, placing the whole matter in the hands of the Bureau of Fisheries, and thereby eliminating the charge that it is a pork-barrel measure. The bureau is the best-informed group on the matters herein proposed and could insure both efficient and economic results in this Federal expenditure.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. If it had had any of the features of a pork-barrel bill, we could have placed hatcheries enough in different States of the Union to have carried it against all possible opposition. There is no question about that. We could have included the State of New York and the State of Wisconsin; so there is no ground whatever for that suggestion.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, if there was one argument needed for the passage of this amendment, that argument is furnished by the statement of the chairman of the committee. [Applause on the Republican side.] I think we would have liked to establish the station in Wisconsin and the one on Long Island, and probably the one in Colorado, but the Members of the House are refusing to vote for these amendments, no matter how meritorious they may appear, because if you open up the bill in that way there is no limit at all, and it will be loaded down by every sort of proposal, and that is pork-barrel legislation with emphasis; for that reason it seems to me that we ought to adopt this amendment and thereby foreclose this unsavory element from the suspicion of which we can not otherwise get rid.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FESS. If I have time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has one-half minute remaining.

Mr. FESS. I yield to my friend from Minnesota.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Do you not think the only way in which we can abolish this unsavory element is to do away with State lines? Do you not think that so long as State lines exist we will be open to the charge of passing pork-barrel legislation?

Mr. BUTLER. How are we to get rid of State lines?

Mr. FESS. In the early part of the discussion I asked the question whether there was cooperation between the State and Federal Government. The solution, it seems to me, is for the States to meet the Federal Government at least half way. At least that would be one solution. If the States do not cooperate with the Federal Government, then let the Federal Government eliminate all the State lines, so far as this legislation goes, giving the proper bureau the authority to locate the stations with reference to National needs rather than State desires.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss] has suggested a very easy plan by which this House can evade its responsibilities, and escape a great deal of irksome and laborious work. This plan is to appropriate a lump sum in every case before us, and leave to some other body, or functionary the task of working out every detail in connection with its expenditure. How easy it would be, to make this plan apply to every department of Government. We could appropriate a lump sum for pensions, and leave the Pension Bureau to determine the beneficiaries of this appropriation and the amount proper to be paid to us. This would save us much trouble, and doubtless effect great economies. Again we could appropriate a lump sum for rivers and harbors, and turn over to some one functionary or board the task of determining the meritorious projects, thus relieving ourselves from the troubles and annoyances incident to the passage of a river and harbor bill. We could appropriate a lump sum for the Army, leaving the Secretary of War to work out a complete plan for its application, with authority to determine our entire military policy. By applying this method in other directions, we would be able to rid ourselves of an immense amount of work and responsibility that apparently the Constitution intended should be imposed upon this body, and executed in the due discharge of our duty. I think the time has come for this body to disregard these insulting intimations that it is incapable of discharging its constitutional functions in a decent and honorable fashion, and do our plain duty in the disposition of the business of this House. The suggestion that we should shunt our work upon some other body, on the ground that we can not dispose of the public business save by pork-barrel methods, is a reflection upon this House. [Applause.]

Should we pass this amendment it would be equivalent to saying to the country that we are unwilling to do our plain duty, or to dispose of a meritorious proposition upon its merits, for fear that some penny-a-liner might suggest that there was a taint of the pork barrel in our action. A body that is afraid to act, lest it may be criticized, or its motives be impugned, will never act. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I am astonished that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] is willing to say that we should seek to escape and evade our responsibilities in the manner suggested. Let us go forward, and with the facts before us, dispose of this bill in the manner that seems just and fitting. In that way we will meet the just expectations of the public; and if in the discharge of our duty we enact a measure so plainly meritorious as the one under consideration, we need not be afraid of the intimation, from whatever quarter it may come that we have acted from unworthy, or with improper motives. [Applause.]

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have only a word to say upon the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss]. In my judgment, to adopt it would be to take a distinct legislative step backward. We ought to do just as little of lump-sum appropriating in the House of Representatives and in the Senate as it is possible for us to do, consistently with the best public service. [Applause.] For, as has been suggested by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] who has just spoken, if we wish to establish in this country a bureaucracy more powerful than we legislators ourselves are, all we need to do is to turn the millions of the national appropriations over to the unguided discretion of people in the executive offices. [Applause.] We abandon our duties as national legislators when we give to people in the departments the public moneys in lump sums to be expended at their discretion.

It was the duty of the committee which reported this bill to secure the opinion of the experts in the Department of Commerce and in the Bureau of Fisheries as to the merits of the respective propositions embodied in the pending bill; and that is exactly what that committee did. From reading the report

of the committee I understand that the officers of that department and of that bureau gave their unqualified approval to every provision in this bill, with the possible exception of one. Yet, notwithstanding this approval, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss], by his amendment, proposes that we shall abandon the bill and instead give hundreds of thousands of dollars to that bureau to expend in its discretion. I am opposed to a lump-sum appropriation in this case and in all other cases, except the very few where there may exist a real public emergency. [Applause.]

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, with much of what my colleague [Mr. COOPER] has said I agree, but as between the expenditure of money through lump-sum appropriations by an administrative body that has information and facts and this Congress endeavoring to decide this question without information or facts, I am for the administrative body. [Applause.] In the public interest and in the interest of economy, in the interest of this country, rather than this body acting blindly we had better have an administrative body acting with information.

With reference to this matter I want to ask—and I assure him that I ask for information—the chairman of the committee or the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] whether during the consideration of this bill they asked the Bureau of Fisheries or the Department of Commerce for a recommendation to that committee of where throughout the United States they believed the fish-hatchery stations should be located or whether they merely referred certain bills to the Department and asked for a report upon them?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I will state to the gentleman that on different occasions, in personal conversation with Dr. Smith, of the Bureau of Fisheries, I told him that I wanted him to report those States where they thought they ought to be established, without reference to the claims of the membership of the House. I have had that policy in mind all the while and have pursued no other.

Mr. LENROOT. I do not know whether the committee has gathered the substance of the gentleman's statement or not. I want to ask him to correct me if I am incorrect. He states that he has asked the department to recommend only such bills as the department believed were necessary. My question to the gentleman was whether they had asked the department to give this committee information as to where throughout the United States they believed that stations should be located. Evidently from the gentleman's answer they have not, but they have limited their inquiry to this bureau merely to bills that have been introduced in this House and asked the bureau to distinguish between bills without reference at all to the needs of the country concerning the establishment of stations.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that there were two bills referred to the committee from the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. LENROOT. One.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Two; and they were among the bills referred to the Department of Commerce.

Mr. LENROOT. Did the department ever make a report on those bills?

Mr. ALEXANDER. It did not.

Mr. LENROOT. Were the bills actually referred to the department?

Mr. ALEXANDER. There were 66 bills referred to the department, and these for Wisconsin were among them.

Mr. LENROOT. What was the report?

Mr. ALEXANDER. They reported in favor of 15 bills, which are included in this omnibus bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LENROOT. Was there any report made on the Wisconsin bill?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I think not; but I assume that it was considered by the department.

Mr. LENROOT. I want to ask this further question: Is there any item in this omnibus bill that is not covered by some bill introduced by some Member? In other words, has the committee recommended a single station anywhere in the United States that was not covered by some special bill?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I think not; but I think if you will look you will see that the needs of the country are pretty well covered.

Mr. LENROOT. Did the committee consider the needs of the United States other than by bills introduced by individual Members?

Mr. ALEXANDER. It did not; we assumed that they were in a better position to know the needs of the country than the committee.

Mr. LENROOT. Now, we have the gentleman's answer, and that means, if it means anything, a pork barrel, because the gentleman admits that the committee did not consider the question on its merits, but considered the needs of the country on the proposition solely of what Members of the House wanted stations in their district.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a word in reply to what was said by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT]. If the gentleman has demonstrated anything, it is his great ability for discovering a mare's nest. There is not a section of the United States that has not had some Member alert enough to introduce a bill for a fish hatchery if that State had any possible claim. So the committee has had the whole United States before it in its investigation and has reported this bill as the most deserving set of bills introduced before the committee and the most deserving that could have been introduced.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I understood the gentleman from Missouri to say that 66 different bills were introduced at the last session and that they were all referred to the Commissioner of Fisheries. Were they all reported upon?

Mr. ALEXANDER. This committee has reported—

Mr. MANN. No; did the Commissioner of Fisheries report back to the committee on these bills?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I assume that they were all considered, but he did not report upon all of them.

Mr. MANN. Since when does an executive officer of the Government, when bills are referred to him, determine whether to report upon them or not, as he thinks best?

Mr. ALEXANDER. We referred these bills to the department with the request that it make a selection and report the bills on their merit.

Mr. MANN. I think that is not the way that this omnibus bill was created. There was no general report upon all of these bills recommending the passage of a bill providing only for those 18 items. I think the gentleman will find that the Commissioner of Fisheries, properly fulfilling the functions of his office, made a report on all of these bills that were referred to him, and that the committee took up those that it happened to see lying before it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Foss) there were—ayes 42, noes 93.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report the bill to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BARNHART, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 15617, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to demand a separate vote, I suggest to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] that it is now almost 5 o'clock. The previous question has been ordered upon the bill, and as there will undoubtedly be a roll call upon the bill, I suggest that it go over until to-morrow.

Mr. ALEXANDER. That will be satisfactory, but I desire to call up for consideration the Alaska fisheries bill.

Mr. MANN. That can be arranged. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to pass over temporarily the consideration of the present bill, the previous question having been ordered upon the amendments and bill to final passage.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I have no objection to that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois that this bill be temporarily passed over until to-morrow, the previous question having been ordered?

There was no objection.

ALASKA FISHERIES.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 17499, for the protection, regulation, and conservation of the fisheries of Alaska, and for other purposes, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk reported the bill by title.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, under the rules of the House, this bill being upon the Union Calendar, I understand that the House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] in the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. RAKER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill H. R. 17499, the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 17499) for the protection, regulation, and conservation of the fisheries of Alaska, and for other purposes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent has been requested that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now arise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RAKER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 17499, the Alaska fisheries bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. STERLING was granted leave to withdraw from the files, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Martha O. Balch, H. R. 4613, no adverse report having been made thereon.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leaves of absence were granted as follows:

To Mr. FINLEY (on request of Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina), indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. WILSON of Florida (on request of Mr. CLARK of Florida), indefinitely, on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet to-morrow, Thursday, December 7, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, submitting detailed estimates of additional expenditures made necessary under provisions of an act making appropriations for the naval service approved August 29, 1916, and of an act to establish a Coast Guard station on the coast of Louisiana, approved June 28, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1413); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Director of the Mint, submitting urgent estimates of deficiencies in appropriations for the service of the current fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 1414); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Chief of Division of Printing and Stationery of this office, submitting urgent estimate of deficiency in the appropriation for "Contingent expenses, Treasury Department, stationery," for the current fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 1415); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War, submitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for contingent expenses, War Department, and stationery, War Department (H. Doc. No. 1416); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, submitting an estimate of deficiency in the appropriation, "Distinctive paper for United States securities," for the fiscal year 1917 (H. Doc. No. 1417); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a statement showing the required information regarding typewriting machines purchased and exchanged by the Post Office Department during the fiscal year 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1418); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a statement of expenditures of the appropriations for the United States Court of Customs Appeals for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1419); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a detailed statement showing the place, quantity, and price of seeds purchased and the dates of purchase, as required by the Agricultural appropriation act, approved March 4, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1420); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

9. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a statement showing the sums paid from the funds allotted to the Bureau of Chemistry for compensation of or payment to officers or other persons employed by State, county, or municipal governments during the fiscal year 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1421); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

10. A letter from the president of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a statement showing in detail what officers and employees of the commission have traveled on official business from Washington to points outside of the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1422); to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

11. A letter from the Superintendent of Library Building and Grounds, transmitting information required by section 5 of the deficiency act approved March 4, 1915, regarding purchases of typewriting machines and exchanges made in part payment therefor by the Library of Congress during the fiscal year 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1423); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

12. A letter from the secretary of the Excise Board for the District of Columbia, transmitting annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1424); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

13. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, submitting deficiency estimates for wages and contingent expenses of the United States mint at Philadelphia (H. Doc. No. 1425); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

14. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a statement showing the exchange of typewriters, adding machines, and other similar labor-saving devices in the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1426); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

15. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a statement showing, for the fiscal year 1916, the motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles and motor boats purchased by the Department of Agriculture for use outside of the District of Columbia, and the cost of maintenance thereof (H. Doc. No. 1427); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

16. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copy of letter from Messrs. Daly, Hoyt & Mason, counselors at law, of New York, N. Y., inclosing a report of the operations of the Maritime Canal Co., of Nicaragua, in accordance with section 6 of the act of Congress approved February 20, 1889 (H. Doc. No. 1428); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

17. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, transmitting a statement of typewriters, adding machines, and other

labor-saving devices exchanged in part payment for new machines during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1429); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

18. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, transmitting detailed statements of expenditures from the appropriations "Contingent expenses, Department of Labor, 1914," for the period from December 1, 1915, to June 30, 1916; "Contingent expenses, Department of Labor, 1915," for the period from December 1, 1915, to November 22, 1916; and "Contingent expenses, Department of Labor, 1916," for the period from July 1, 1915, to November 22, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1430); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Labor and ordered to be printed.

19. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the state of the finances for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1431); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

20. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, transmitting statement of travel performed during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916, by officers and employees of the Department of Labor on official business from Washington, D. C., to the points outside of the District of Columbia (H. Doc. No. 1432); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Labor and ordered to be printed.

21. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting annual report of the operations of the Postal Savings System for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1433); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and ordered to be printed.

22. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of the contingent expenses of the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1434); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

23. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a detailed statement of the manner in which the appropriation "Miscellaneous expenses, Department of Agriculture, 1916," has been expended (H. Doc. No. 1435); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

24. A letter from the Public Printer, transmitting a statement relative to purchase, exchange, and repair of typewriting machines in the Government Printing Office, covering the period from July 1, 1915, to June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1436); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

25. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a complete set of general rules and regulations prescribed by the Board of Supervising Inspectors, Steamboat-Inspection Service, and a copy of circular letter containing amendments of the regulations adopted by the executive committee of the Board of Supervising Inspectors (H. Doc. No. 1437); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries and ordered to be printed.

26. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a detailed report of the publications received and distributed by that department during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1438); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

27. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a detailed statement of expenditures of the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1439); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

28. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a statement showing in detail the travel from Washington to points outside of the District of Columbia performed by officers and employees of the Department of Agriculture during the fiscal year 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1440); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

29. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, transmitting an itemized report of the actual expenditures during the fiscal year 1916, from the appropriations, "Miscellaneous expenses, Bureau of Naturalization, 1914," "Miscellaneous expenses, Bureau of Naturalization, 1915," and "Miscellaneous expenses, Bureau of Naturalization, 1916" (H. Doc. No. 1441); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Labor and ordered to be printed.

30. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a petition from the employees of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce and also the employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, both of this department, requesting an increase in salaries of the classified employees in the Government serv-

ice (H. Doc. No. 1442); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

31. A letter from the president of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a statement showing, typewriters, adding machines, and other similar labor-saving devices purchased during the fiscal year 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1443); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

32. A letter from the acting chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting report of typewriters, adding machines, and other similar labor-saving devices exchanged during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1444); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

33. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting information as to number of members of the National Guard taken into the service of the United States, who are recruits without previous military service, as requested in House resolution 326, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session (H. Doc. No. 1445); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

34. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, calling attention to certain items in estimates of appropriations for the Lighthouse Service for the fiscal year 1918 which have not been authorized by Congress, and requesting that the necessary authority be enacted into law (H. Doc. No. 1446); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LA FOLLETTE, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 1792) for the relief of settlers on unsurveyed railroad lands, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1207), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SHERWOOD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 18181) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the civil war and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1206), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 18182) to authorize the Secretary of State to enter into negotiations with the Republic of Chile for the purpose of entering into a convention for the settlement of all claims owned by citizens of the United States against the Republic of Chile and by citizens of the Republic of Chile against the United States of America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 18183) for the support and education of the Indian pupils at the Fort Bidwell Indian School, Cal.; for repairs and improvements, erecting new buildings and furnishing the same, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 18184) to authorize the Washington & Old Dominion Railway Co. to acquire by purchase or condemnation the land and property necessary for terminal facilities and trackage in the District of Columbia, at or near Thirty-fourth and M Streets NW.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 18185) for the support and education of the Indian pupils at the Greenville Indian School, Cal.; for repairs and improvements; for new school building, erecting building and furnishing the same; for installation of laundry and equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 18186) to conserve the supply of boots, shoes, and manufactured leather goods and leather of the United States and to protect the people from extortionate prices by temporarily prohibiting the export of the same; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18187) to conserve the supply of print paper of the United States and to protect publishers of news-

papers from extortionate prices by temporarily prohibiting the export of print paper; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 18188) to increase the wages, of employees of the United States Government, District of Columbia, or either House of Congress; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 18189) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver one mounted bronze cannon on carriage to city of Lawrenceville, Ill.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: A bill (H. R. 18190) for the control, regulation, and use of the waters of the Niagara River below Niagara Falls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DILL: A bill (H. R. 18191) to make public all income-tax returns of persons who pay an income tax to the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PARK: A bill (H. R. 18192) to repeal an act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States, approved July 1, 1898, and all amendments thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 18193) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 18194) for the purchase of a site and erection of a public building thereon at Shelbyville, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 18195) to increase the pensions of the blind who served in the War with Mexico or the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GLASS: A bill (H. R. 18196) to amend the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BORLAND: Resolution (H. Res. 389) directing the Federal Trade Commission to investigate and report to the House of Representatives the facts relating to the production, marketing, and distribution of food products in the United States, together with any violations of the antitrust laws in connection therewith, and recommendations for greater economy and efficiency in the marketing of food products and the punishment and prevention of extortion in the prices thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LLOYD: Resolution (H. Res. 390) to pay Helen Sherman; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. DILL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 311) authorizing the Attorney General to make an immediate investigation to determine the cause or causes of the unreasonable advances in the prices of foodstuffs, fabrics, paper, fuel, and clothing, and report the facts as to differences between prices paid to producer and paid by consumer for same; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SWIFT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 312) to convey the thanks of Congress to officials of the fire department of the Greater City of New York, and through them to the officers and crews of the fire boats of said department, for the prompt and heroic service rendered by them in rescuing lives and salvaging property at the explosion and fire at Black Tom Pier, Jersey City, N. J., July 30, 1916; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 64) for joint action of Congress and the President to secure peace among the nations, and in the event of failure to so regulate the industries and business of the people as to relieve them of the burden of the wars; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 18181) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; to the Committee of the Whole House and ordered to be printed.

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 18197) granting an increase of pension to John F. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18198) granting an increase of pension to Miles C. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18199) granting an increase of pension to Barney Everett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 18200) granting an increase of pension to John W. Newton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18201) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Keen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18202) granting an increase of pension to James Hobbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18203) granting an increase of pension to Michael Fivecoats; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARKLEY: A bill (H. R. 18204) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Plumb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18205) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Gaines; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18206) granting an increase of pension to Franklin R. Beamon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18207) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel Gott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BENNET: A bill (H. R. 18208) for the relief of Horatio McIntire; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18209) to add the name of Joseph J. Esterbrook to the Army and Navy medal of honor roll; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 18210) granting an increase of pension to Perry J. Hainey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18211) granting an increase of pension to Samuel M. Carson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 18212) granting an increase of pension to Marsha E. Towles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18213) granting a pension to Fred F. Bennett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18214) granting an increase of pension to David Byers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18215) granting an increase of pension to Dzonra Tucker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18216) granting an increase of pension to John C. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18217) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARAWAY: A bill (H. R. 18218) granting an increase of pension to Alfred C. Mullinax; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18219) granting an increase of pension to Solomon Kessinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18220) granting an increase of pension to William R. Gray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18221) granting an increase of pension to William Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNELLY: A bill (H. R. 18222) granting an increase of pension to Isaac N. Estep; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 18223) granting an increase of pension to William A. Ice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18224) granting an increase of pension to Stith M. Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 18225) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Steele; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRUKKER: A bill (H. R. 18226) granting an increase of pension to George W. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 18227) granting a pension to Arabella Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18228) granting a pension to Hiram C. Barrows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FARLEY: A bill (H. R. 18229) granting a pension to Anna Margaret Venus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FARR: A bill (H. R. 18230) granting a pension to Maria Coggins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18231) granting a pension to Benjamin Hughes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18232) granting an increase of pension to Harriett Karr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18233) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Alexander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 18234) granting a pension to Katharine McCormick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 18235) granting a pension to Charles V. D. Blackmar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 18236) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Speer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18237) granting a pension to Edward F. Locker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18238) granting an increase of pension to Albert Downing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18239) granting an increase of pension to Cordelia J. Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18240) granting an increase of pension to George A. C. Coffey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18241) granting an increase of pension to Charles Aldrich; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18242) granting an increase of pension to William Himes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18243) granting a pension to Martha A. Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18244) granting an increase of pension to A. L. Byers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 18245) granting a pension to Anna Frohs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER: A bill (H. R. 18246) granting an increase of pension to John F. Ford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18247) granting a pension to Manella A. Eastman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18248) granting an increase of pension to John P. Hodgkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18249) granting an increase of pension to Theodore Dutra; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18250) granting a pension to Edward C. Danforth; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 18251) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Foust; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18252) granting an increase of pension to Abel G. Morse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18253) granting an increase of pension to William T. Slocum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18254) granting an increase of pension to Lewis H. McChesney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18255) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Franz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18256) granting an increase of pension to Nancy S. Kibler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18257) granting an increase of pension to James L. Doris; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18258) granting an increase of pension to Laura E. Elliott; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 18259) granting an increase of pension to Alpheus Demond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18260) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Beeman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18261) granting an increase of pension to Lottie E. Newell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18262) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Carr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18263) granting an increase of pension to John W. Whitbeck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 18264) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18265) granting a pension to Annie Garner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18266) granting an increase of pension to Abraham Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 18267) granting an increase of pension to Washington Foss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 18268) granting an increase of pension to John A. Medley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 18269) granting an increase of pension to William Watson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18270) granting an increase of pension to S. B. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 18271) granting a pension to James A. Swain; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18272) granting an increase of pension to Alvin G. Woodworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18273) granting an increase of pension to William Douglas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18274) granting an increase of pension to Jefferson D. Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18275) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Lee; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 18276) granting a pension to Margaret A. Wells; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18277) granting an increase of pension to Christopher Hummel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18278) granting an increase of pension to William C. McKelvy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18279) granting a pension to William H. Hopkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18280) granting an increase of pension to Abraham Rhodes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLEY: A bill (H. R. 18281) granting a pension to William E. Sloane; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18282) granting a pension to Martha P. Malcomson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINCHELOE: A bill (H. R. 18283) granting an increase of pension to Henry Barr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 18284) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18285) granting an increase of pension to Nancy A. Lantz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KONOP: A bill (H. R. 18286) for the relief of Charles E. Thompson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18287) granting an increase of pension to James E. Webb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KREIDER: A bill (H. R. 18288) granting an increase of pension to Jane M. Spidel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18289) granting an increase of pension to Nicholas Wolf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LENROOT: A bill (H. R. 18290) granting a pension to Retta H. Lore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 18291) for the relief of the heirs of A. M. Riser, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 18292) to grant an increase of pension to James T. Rolf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 18293) granting an increase of pension to Otis H. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18294) granting a pension to John A. Schreck; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18295) granting a pension to Leonard Ripple; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18296) granting a pension to Albert A. Kelly; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18297) granting a pension to Walter Sewell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 18298) granting an increase of pension to Mary Alice Brightwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18299) granting an increase of pension to William R. Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18300) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Cottrill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOFT: A bill (H. R. 18301) granting a pension to John R. Crayton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18302) granting a pension to Pauline K. Boden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18303) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18304) granting a pension to Sarah K. Arnett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18305) granting an increase of pension to Erasmus Bucy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18306) granting an increase of pension to John Douglass; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18307) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius Dorsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18308) granting an increase of pension to Dorothy Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18309) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Gaskins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18310) granting an increase of pension to Amelia D. Grove; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18311) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Aplin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18312) granting an increase of pension to Elias Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 18313) granting an increase of pension to Florence S. L'Hommiedieu; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18314) granting a pension to Loren Bishop; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18315) granting an increase of pension to Annie E. Doss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18316) granting an increase of pension to Martha Sollenberger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Br. Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 18317) for the relief of W. L. Clifford, formerly a letter carrier, now a clerk in the service of the Post Office Department of the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18318) granting an increase of pension to John K. McBain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 18319) granting a pension to Deborah Nash; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 18320) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Glenn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18321) granting an increase of pension to Samuel L. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18322) granting an increase of pension to Hugh S. Stanley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAGEE: A bill (H. R. 18323) granting a pension to Charlotte A. Lansing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEEKER: A bill (H. R. 18324) for the relief of Mrs. E. W. Sankey; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 18325) granting an increase of pension to Felix Dodd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 18326) for the relief of George S. Boutwell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 18327) granting an increase of pension to James Chadwick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 18328) granting an increase of pension to Emily Hughes Burch; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18329) granting an increase of pension to John Doss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRATT: A bill (H. R. 18330) granting a pension to Byron S. Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18331) granting a pension to Sarah Lyon Brundage; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18332) granting an increase of pension to William H. Farrar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18333) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Jenkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18334) granting a pension to Rudolph Allmers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 18335) granting a pension to T. J. Hurlbut; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 18336) granting an increase of pension to Charles Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18337) granting an increase of pension to Lora Milliken; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18338) granting an increase of pension to Joel N. Andrews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18339) granting an increase of pension to Josephine De Groat; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 18340) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 18341) granting a pension to George M. Erwin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18342) for the relief of Andrew L. Meadows; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 18343) granting a pension to Albert Haines; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18344) granting a pension to Alfred J. Yarber; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18345) granting an increase of pension to Uriah J. Favorite; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHOUSE: A bill (H. R. 18346) granting an increase of pension to Valentine B. Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18347) granting an increase of pension to Simeon G. Hubbard; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18348) granting an increase of pension to Charles Grant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18349) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. McClintick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18350) granting an increase of pension to Edward H. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18351) granting an increase of pension to Wilsey E. Sivers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18352) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Umphenour; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18353) granting an increase of pension to John M. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18354) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18355) granting an increase of pension to Jefferson W. Lewelling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18356) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Carrigg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18357) granting a pension to Marie Viglini; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 18358) granting an increase of pension to Samuel G. Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18359) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEELE of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 18360) granting an increase of pension to Alfred D. Collier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18361) granting an increase of pension to Alvin Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18362) granting an increase of pension to William H. Rickman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18363) granting a pension to Mrs. Louisa Powell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 18364) granting an increase of pension to Ann Bates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAVENNER: A bill (H. R. 18365) granting an increase of pension to George W. Kilpatrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18366) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Bachman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18367) granting an increase of pension to William N. Butler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 18368) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Walters; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 18369) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Scattergood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 18370) granting an increase of pension to William Vaughn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 18371) granting an increase of pension to George F. Chambers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 18372) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary Brown Point; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18373) granting a pension to Martha Coe De Witt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BACHARACH: Memorial of National Live Stock Shippers' Protective League, relative to regulation of rates on intrastate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petitions of Local Union No. 2233, Beaverville; Local Union No. 1056, Gallitzin; Local Union No. 1294, Lilly; Local Union No. 1269, Elmora; Local Union No. 1992, Amsbury; Local Union No. 3084, Six-Mile Run; Local Union No. 1043, Portage; Local Union No. 472, South Fork; Local Union No. 1396, Nanty Glo; Local Union No. 95, Defiance; Local Union No. 616, Hastings; and Local Union No. 3068, Dysart, United Mine Workers of America, all in the State of Pennsylvania, favoring immediate investigation of the excessive prices of foodstuffs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petition of Henry F. O'Brien, of New York, favoring passage of the Nolan bill, House bill 11876; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of National Association Surviving Union Volunteer Officers of the Civil War, favoring passage of the volunteer officers' retired list bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of New York, favoring passage of post-office pension bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the United Anglers' League, favoring passage of House bill 14120, for a Long Island hatchery; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of Arthur D. Webb, favoring passage of House bill 15312, to fix the compensation of inspectors of customs at the port of New York; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: Petition of City Council of Columbus, Ohio, favoring embargo on shipment of foodstuffs to Europe; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EAGAN: Memorial of Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association, relative to intracoastal waterway along Atlantic seaboard; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of Rome, Ga., favoring an embargo on the exportation of food products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of National Paint, Oil, and Varnish Association, favoring the Stephens-Ashurst bill for fixed prices, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, papers to accompany a bill granting a pension to Anna Froles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Moran & Hastings Manufacturing Co., of Chicago, Ill., favoring 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HILL: Petition of William P. Holmes and others, of Bridgeport, Conn., against sectarian appropriations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Men's Assembly of First Methodist Episcopal Church of Bridgeport, Conn., favoring House bill 3107, to forbid interstate transmission of race-gambling bets; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of William P. Holmes and others, of Bridgeport, Conn., against sale, manufacture, etc., of intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), memorial of Men's Assembly of First Methodist Episcopal Church of Bridgeport, Conn., favoring Federal motion-picture commission; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. KAHN: Memorial of California State Federation of Labor, protesting against increased cost of white paper for newspaper use; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of California State Federation of Labor, favoring retirement legislation for aged employees of Federal Government; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, memorial of Corona Club and Voltoria Colonna Club, of San Francisco, Cal., favoring the Kent bill (House bill 11864) for Federal aid for nonresident tuberculosis patients; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Dr. William C. Hassler, of San Francisco, Cal., favoring House bill 193 for national leprosum; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Vallejo (Cal.) Trades and Labor Council, favoring embargo on shipments of foodstuffs to Europe; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Building Trades Council of San Francisco, Cal., favoring a Federal investigation of the high cost of living; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of California State Federation of Labor, relative to Alaska salmon-fishing industry and the welfare of the workmen employed therein; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: Petition of sundry citizens of the United States, favoring House joint resolution 264; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MAGEE (by request): Petitions of 28 citizens of Onondaga County, N. Y.; also, 66 citizens of Onondaga County, N. Y., for a Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIORDAN: Petition for increase of pay of members of the stenographers and typewriting corps of the New York Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SNELL: Resolution of the Northern New York Development League, urging the passage of the Webb bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NORTH: Petitions of Local Union No. 1295, United Mine Workers of America, Glen Campbell, Pa., representing 200 members; Local Union No. 673, United Mine Workers of America, Soldier, Pa., representing 400 members; Local Union No. 738, United Mine Workers of America, Coal Glen, Pa., representing 100 members; Local Union No. 626, United Mine Workers of America, Desire, Pa., representing 265 members; and Local Union No. 1310, United Mine Workers of America, Wals-ton, Pa., representing 163 members, praying for the appointment of a commission to proceed to devise ways and means to restore the food prices back to something near normal; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: Petition of John Van Ness and others, of Narberth, Pa., favoring amendment abolishing polygamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of E. T. Batting and 56 other citizens of Montgomery County, Pa., and also petition of Thomas L. Heston and 35 other citizens of Montgomery County, Pa., for an embargo on foodstuffs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, December 7, 1916.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come to Thee at the beginning of a new legislative day and lift our hearts to Thee for guidance and blessing. May we begin the duties of this day with a consciousness of the Divine presence. We thank Thee for the spirit of prayer that has been among the people, and for the spirit of men and women who have ever kept in touch with God and kept alive a sense of the Divine providence and leadership with us as a people. We pray that in a spirit of reverence and godly fear we may perform the duties of this day. For Christ's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings.

Mr. THOMPSON. I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to have the Journal read this morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is objection. The reading will be proceeded with.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the Journal, and it was approved.

SENATOR FROM CONNECTICUT.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the certificate of the governor of Connecticut certifying to the election of GEORGE P. McLEAN as a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1917, which will be read.

The certificate was read and ordered to be placed on the files of the Senate, as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November, 1916, GEORGE P. McLEAN was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Connecticut a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1917.

Witness: His excellency our governor, MARCUS H. HOLCOMB, and our seal hereto affixed at Hartford, this 6th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1916.

By the governor:

[SEAL.]

MARCUS H. HOLCOMB,
Governor.

By his excellency's command:

CHARLES D. BURNES, Secretary of State.

COMMITTEE SERVICE.

Mr. GALLINGER was, on his own motion, excused from further service upon the Committee on Pacific Railroads.

Mr. PAGE was, on his own motion, excused from further service upon the Committee on Indian Affairs.

On motion of Mr. LODGE, it was

Ordered, That Mr. JAMES E. WATSON, Senator from Indiana, be appointed to the following committees: Commerce, Indian Depredations, Pacific Railroads, Transportation Routes to the Seaboard, and Revolutionary Claims.

Ordered, That Mr. BERT M. FERNALD, Senator from Maine, be appointed to the following committees: Claims, Fisheries, Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, Public Buildings and Grounds, Coast Defenses, and Indian Affairs.

REPORT OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE (H. DOC. NO. 1493).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service for the fiscal year 1916, which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine and ordered to be printed.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (H. DOC. NO. 1483).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Attorney General of the United States for the fiscal year 1916, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

PURCHASE OF VEHICLES (H. DOC. NO. 1427).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement showing the number of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger vehicles and motor boats purchased by the department for use outside the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1916, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

EXCHANGE OF TYPEWRITERS (H. DOC. NO. 1426).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant